

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, April, 1902.

THE SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CENTRAL DIVISION OF THE MODERN LAN- GUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

THE seventh annual meeting of the Central Division of the Modern Language Association of America was held at Champaign, Ill., Dec. 26-28. In point of attendance and general quality of the papers read there seemed to be indications of an increased interest and elevation of standards in the Mississippi Valley, from which the membership of the Central Division is principally drawn. On Thursday evening the annual address of the president was given by Prof. James Taft Hatfield of Northwestern University. His discussion of *Scholarship and the Commonwealth* was most felicitous in theme and very rich in suggestions for the future of the Modern Language Association. Among others the point was made that academic education should stand in closer relation to civic life; that the university should be training more men for the state and that the state should look more to the university for men to fill its offices. He emphasized the importance of having the Modern Language Association act as a unit in elevating the work and the importance of its members to their proper position. It was also suggested in view of the number of excellent teachers who are unable to obtain positions, while incompetent and poorly prepared teachers with some influence are often appointed, that the Modern Language Association use its influence to endeavor through its officers to exercise some control over the appointments of instructors in modern language work in colleges and high schools, or at least that it should be regarded as a court of reference in regard to the qualification of candidates for such positions. With regard to the value of the Association and the annual meetings to the members, Prof. Hatfield said:

"It is, therefore, worth much to us, scattered, isolated, and almost swallowed up in the great

ocean of American commercialism, that we should now and then come together and refresh our faith in the value of our mission; that of faithfully keeping alive the tender plant of pure humanism. It is profitable to meet now and then, were it only to encourage us as guardians of that fair and serene domain, whose interests are all those most sacred ideals which our better humanity loves and cherishes."

The opening monologue of Goethe's Faust, with special reference to lines 418-429 was the title of the first paper of the session on Friday morning, read by Prof. A. R. Hohlfeld, of the University of Wisconsin. It consisted of: 1. A critical review of the literature on this topic from Scherer's article of 1886 to Minor's interpretation of 1901. 2. A list of mooted points on which opinion still differs more or less. 3. A detailed treatment of these points, especially of the crucial line, *Fleiß! Auf! Hin aus ins weite Land*, and of Scherer's *Flickverse: Ihr schwebt, ihr Geister*, etc. In conclusion Prof. Hohlfeld expressed the opinion that logical and artistic consistency exists in the scene, but that Collin's and Minor's view must be modified in several important respects.

Prof. Albert E. Jack's paper consisted of a study of *English Elegiac Poetry, with a Bibliography*. The different forms of elegiac poetry were discussed and brief reference was made to the individual works of some of the more representative writers of elegiac poetry. The possibility of influence of the Italian poets in Tennyson's *In Memoriam*, particularly that of Petrarch's sonnets was also mentioned, and attention was called to coincidences in metre, as well as to the testimony of the English poet's diary.

In What Order Shall Luther's Works Be Read was discussed by Dr. W. W. Florer of the University of Michigan. Attention was called to the fact, that, although Luther's importance in the development of the NHG. written language is recognized by every scholar, his works do not receive due consideration in the college curriculum. Dr. Florer made an earnest plea for more general recognition of Luther's importance and believe that better results might be obtained if a beginning

were made with the Bible translation of 1545, which represents Luther's fullest development and offers but few linguistic difficulties. After having been thus introduced to Luther's vocabulary through a work the subject of which he is perfectly familiar with, the student may profitably take up the earlier writings of Luther. Dr. Florer also advocated the reading of the modern revisions and translations of the Bible by the beginner before entering upon the study of the German classics.

The paper of Prof. C. von Klenze, of the University of Chicago, was of more than usual interest and bore evidence of an immense amount of investigation. The subject was *Goethe's Predecessors in Italy*. The essayist stated that it was an attempt to ascertain whether the poet's attitude to Italy, its art and artists, its national life, etc., as expressed in the *Italienische Reise*, was original with Goethe, or simply a reflection of the traditional view expressed in a maturer and more powerful form. An examination of travelers' accounts of Italy published during the eighteenth century shows that up to about 1786 there existed no appreciation for anything but the antique; Medieval art was despised, the early Renaissance art was unknown and Michelangelo was regarded as a barbarian. The eighteenth century traveler missed the flavor and color of cities; he traveled without appreciation, merely from curiosity. Addison, for example, thoroughly familiar with his Latin, sees only antiquity; the places which he visits remind one of *passages* from Vergil which he knows by heart. Winckelmann was unable to see anything in Venice; for him it might as well have been a *Pfarrdorf* built out in the ocean. Florence bored him. Prof. von Klenze's conclusion was that Goethe did in Italy precisely all that his predecessors did, and but little more. He was very much interested in Classical antiquity and neglected more and more other forms of art. His is the most powerful and mature expression of that point of view, which we have now outgrown.

One of the few papers of a pedagogical nature was that of Prof. D. K. Dodge, of the University of Illinois, on *Intercollegiate Agreement in English Courses*. Particular emphasis was laid upon the possibility of increasing the

efficiency of graduate work in English by the adoption of something like uniformity in the undergraduate work of the colleges. If a number of the leading universities would agree upon a definite requirement as to amount and kind of work as a pre-requisite for admission to advanced courses, much time and effort would be saved the student. Possibly the presence of courses in Shakespeare and Nineteenth Century poetry in the announcements of nearly all the colleges may be regarded as a sign of a tendency toward at least some uniformity. In the list of required studies Old English should be included.

The paper of Prof. K. Pietsch, of the University of Chicago, discussed an *Old Spanish Version of the Disticha Catonis belonging to the thirteenth century*. The popularity of the *Disticha Catonis* in Spain during the Middle Ages is attested by the number of MSS. and early prints of the Latin original, as well as by allusions to the supposed author and quotations from the *Disticha* in such early Spanish works as the *Libro de Alexandre*, the *Siete Partidas* of King Alfonso el Sabio, the *Castigos e Documentos* of King Sancho IV, the *Sobre el Credo* (MS. of the Escorial) of Pedro Pascual, bishop of Jaen, etc. Most noticeable among these quotations is that found in *Pedro Pascual*, inasmuch as a copla *en cuaderna via* quoted twice by him occurs also in a print of Leon, 1533 (Vienna, Hofbibliothek) entitled *Castigos y exemplos de Caton*, which fact puts it beyond doubt that the *Castigos*, a version of the *Disticha en cuaderna via*, dates as far back as the thirteenth century. Other editions of this version are *Medina del Campo*, 1542 (British Museum, mentioned by Pérez Pastor, *La Imprenta en M. del C.*, p. 17 from *Cat. Heber*); *Medina del Campo*, 1543 (Madrid, Bibl. Nac., found by the essayist); *Burgos*, 1563 (Library of Gayangos cf. *Gallardo*, nr. 514—the copy seems to have disappeared) and *Alcalá de Henares*, 1586 (Library of the Marqués de Jerez, cf. Pérez Pastor, *l. c.*). Prof. Pietsch is engaged upon a reconstruction of the much corrupted text.

A paper by Dr. May Thomas, of the University of Chicago, was entitled *A Comparison of the Tristran and Isolde Story*. The three versions compared were the twelfth century epic

represented by Chrétien de Troyes, the fifteenth century prose version as a typical representative of which Thomas Malory was taken, and Richard Wagner's interpretation in the nineteenth century. The subject was discussed from the standpoint of the different ideals in regard to the position of woman, morality, duty, etc.; reference was also made to the dramatic and technical purpose of the love potion in the different versions.

A very interesting paper on *Some Features of the Technique of Adam Bede* was read by Prof. Violet D. Jayne, of the University of Illinois. The limits of this report unfortunately permit no proper discussion of it, but its value as a study in method makes it desirable that its appearance in print may not be long deferred.

Prof. T. Atkinson Jenkins, of the University of Chicago, presented a paper on the *Sources of Marie de France's Espurgatoire Seint Patriz*. He has found that one of the Harley MSS. of the *Tractatus de Purgatorio Sancti Patricii* contains a text which stands very close to that used by Marie de France in her metrical translation. Use has also been made of the three Latin texts published by Mall in 1889; the Latin and Old French texts will be placed in parallel columns, and will appear in the Decennial Memorial volumes of the University of Chicago. In revising the Old French text the editor profits materially by the reviews of his first edition, especially by those of Messrs. H. A. Todd, K. Warnke, and G. Paris.

The paper of Prof. C. F. McClumpha, of the University of Minnesota, on the *Classification of the Short Story* was introduced by a comparative table of the contents of the November numbers of six popular magazines, showing the amount of space given to the short story in comparison with that devoted to the serial novel, the essay, and poetry. A brief historical sketch of the growth of story-telling was presented in which the essential differences among the various kinds of narrative were pointed out. These differences lead to the many distinctions that furnish possible definitions of the chief forms of fictive narrative known to us to-day as romance, novel, and short story. Special stress was laid on the

many possible distinctions that indicate the exact nature of the short story, in order to separate the short story from that with which it is so often confused, namely, the novel or novelette. The general classification of the novel was then discussed, showing the advantages that could be derived from it in aiding the student to understand the various forms and tendencies of fiction. But the general classification of the novel will not suffice for the short story. Three modes of classification were then presented, each being fully illustrated by selected works: 1. a classification determined by the form of the short story; 2. a classification based on the treatment of the plot; 3. a classification determined by the subject matter. The first mode of classification considers only the formal or exterior part of the story. It is essentially superficial and affords very indefinite results. Every new form may give a new class, but the most frequent forms occurring furnish eight noteworthy classes: 1. the personal or *ego* narrative, 2. the impersonal, 3. the story recounted in a series of letters, 4. in the form of a diary, 5. a combination of all possible forms, namely, letters, telegrams, diary, narrative, etc., 6. it may be a conundrum, 7. it may be a so-called pastel in prose, or prose-poem, 8. it may be dramatic in form, such as a one-act play. The other modes of classification were given in detail and the paper was concluded by a plea for the above classification merely as a means for the study of the short story. While conceding that no table of classification could ever be complete, the writer contended that the study of this recent development in fiction will be facilitated greatly by some scientific mode of classification.

Prof. Starr W. Cutting, of the University of Chicago, had for the subject of his paper, *Das and Was in Relative Clauses Dependent on Substantivized Adjectives in Modern German*. The paper will be published in full in the near future.

The Influence of Wilhelm Müller on Heine's Lyric Poetry, by Prof. John Scholte Nollen, Iowa College, was based upon a metrical study of the works of the two German poets with especial reference to the relation of Heine's *Lyrisches Intermezzo* to Müller's *77 Gedichte*.



In a letter to Wilhelm Müller, dated June 7th, 1826, Heine testifies that he owes the metre as well as the musical effect of his *Intermezzo* to the influence of Müller's lyrics. Though Heine was not always sincere in such admissions of influence, it appears that in this case his statements are correct in every particular. The year 1821, in which Müller's 77 *Gedichte* appeared, was actually pivotal for Heine's lyric poetry in the very things noted in Heine's letter. With this year the crudity, harshness, and roughness, the affectation of primitive effect, the abuse of diminutives and of the horrible, the monotony of rhythm and rime, which characterize many of the poems of the *Junge Leiden*, disappear once for all. Heine had evidently learned from Müller to avoid the superficial imitation of the *Volkslied* that marked his earlier verse. The metre to which Heine refers in his letter must be that of the *Hildebrandston* which is the characteristic form of Müller's collection, appearing far more frequently there than in any other representative collection of German lyrics aside from Heine's. And it appears that that of the *Hildebrandston* is the overwhelmingly prevailing form in Heine's verse exactly during the years 1821 to 1824, when, according to his own statement, he was strongly influenced by Müller. Aside from this one form, the metrical character of Heine's and Müller's verse is widely different. The presumption of Müller's influence upon Heine during the period named is confirmed by the very large number of echoes of motifs and turns of speech from Müller in Heine's poetry. A background was formed for the study of these parallels by an examination of the lyric poetry of Goethe, Tieck, A. W. Schlegel, Brentano, Uhland, Eichendorff, the *Wunderhorn*, and other collections of *Volkslieder*. The argument for the influence of Müller upon Heine in the parallel passages found rests upon the following facts: that there is no corresponding similarity with all the mass of other lyric poetry studied; that the parallel passages almost without exception appear in Müller's poetry earlier than in Heine's; that the coincident passages in Heine's verse belong almost exclusively to the years 1821 to 1824, or are later echoes from these years.

Dr. Philip Allen in his paper on *Wilh. Müller* presented some of the unpublished writings of the German romantic poet, which are to appear in book form during the present year at the University of Chicago Press. These consist of, 1. A Diary, 2. Twenty-four letters, 3. Nine Sonnets, 4. Miscellaneous small papers of interest. This material, much of it of considerable biographical importance, was sent to Dr. Allen and Prof. Hatfield by Mrs. Georgina Müller, wife of the lamented Oxford professor, F. Max Müller, and daughter-in-law of the poet.

The paper of Dr. Marcus Simpson, of Northwestern University, entitled *Notes on Wieland's Translation of Shakespere*, gave some idea of the comparatively little interest which Germany of the eighteenth century felt for the great English poet. Before Wieland's translation Shakespere's dramas were but little known in Germany, although a few translations of separate plays and inaccurate statements and criticisms had appeared. Wieland translated twenty-two dramas under great difficulty with few books and no friends to aid him. The translation (1762-6) was severely criticized by Gerstenberg and ably defended by Lessing. His treatment of Shakespere was mechanical and often unpoetical. Many examples were collected and in part cited showing his inability to render the English original in fitting German. Wieland himself mentions the work but little in his letters. His article in *Teutscher Merkur*, 1773, on *Der Geist Shakespere's*, is of interest as showing the change in Wieland's conception of Shakespeare in the years following his translation. The alterations of the original text made by Pope and Warburton, whose edition he used, were mainly adopted by him, though at times he reverted to the original text for his translation. His worst fault in the work was the ruthless omission of passages and at times of scenes. The translation affected his own work and attitude towards the drama, though he never quite appreciated Shakespere.

The Sources of Cyrano's Histoire Comique des Estats et Empire de la Lune was the title of the paper read by Asst. Prof. John R. Effinger, Jr., of the University of Michigan. The object of this paper was to show how Cyrano, in writing his *Histoire Comique des Estats et*

Empire de la Lune (published in 1656, a year after his death, though probably in manuscript as early as 1649) was influenced,—

1st. By the general notions current in his time regarding the existence of other inhabited worlds and the possibility of aerial navigation, and,

2nd. By a book entitled, *The Man in the Moone, Or a Discourse of a Voyage Thither, by Domingo Gonsales, The Speedy Messenger, London, Printed by John Norton and are to be sold by Joshua Kirton and Thomas Warren, 1636*, which is known to have been written by Francis Godwin, Bishop of Hereford. A French translation by Jean Baudoine, appeared in Paris in 1648. The writer did not claim to be the first to call attention to this English book, but he wished to show by actual comparison, as had not been done before, that beyond the general idea of a lunar voyage, Cyrano had merely copied a few details from Godwin's book, and had then gone on to a general satirical criticism of seventeenth century society in France, which was of far greater scope than anything to be found in the English tale of marvelous adventure, which was Utopian and uncritical. It was shown also, that Cyrano frankly acknowledged his acquaintance with Godwin's book.

Prof. W. E. Simonds, of Knox College, presented a *Record of the Shakespearean Plays Performed in Chicago in Five Seasons*. The dramatic seasons included in this report are those of 1895-'96, '96-'97, '97-'98, '98-'99, '99-'00. The following plays have been produced: Mid. N.'s D., five times; Com. of Er., eight times; Two Gent. of Ver., four times; Much Ado, six times; Twelfth Night, four times; Tam. of the Shrew, twenty-one times; Hen. IV, four times; Mer. of Ven., twenty-six times; As You Like It, twenty times; King Lear, three times; Jul. Cæs., four times; Ant. and Cleo., eight times; Othello, twelve times; Macbeth, nineteen times; Rich. III, twenty-three times; Hamlet, thirty-six times; Rom. and Jul. fifty-nine times; Cymbeline, fifteen times; The Tempest, five times. This gives us a list of nineteen plays of which there were two hundred and eighty-two performances, an average of fifty-six plays for each season.

The paper of Prof. Julius Goebel, of Leland

Stanford Jr. University, on the *Authenticity of Goethe's Sesenheim Songs*, was presented in his absence in a brief summary. An examination of the various arguments which have been advanced against the authenticity of the songs copied in 1835 by Heinrich Kruse, shows that there is not the slightest reason to doubt Kruse's veracity. The originals which Kruse copied were lost, however, when Stoeber in 1837 made his copies. The three poems which were found among the papers of Lenz may have been obtained by the latter from Friederike. The inner evidence derived from a careful study of the style and the diction of the poems goes to prove that all the poems found by Kruse must be ascribed to Goethe.

Prof. Malcolm W. Wallace, of Beloit College, presented the last chapter of a study of the *Influence of Plautus on English Dramatic Literature in the Sixteenth Century*, which is being published by Scott, Foresman and Co. as an introduction to *The Birth of Hercules*, a sixteenth century play. *The Last Decade of the Century* was the title of the chapter read, and an endeavor was made to trace the Plautine influence in *Mother Bombie*, *The Comedy of Errors*, *The Silver Age*, and *Timon of Athens*.

Literary Criticism in France by Prof. E. P. Bailly, of Northwestern University, provoked an animated discussion. The essayist expressed the fear that at present the reading of criticism was tending to replace study of the authors themselves. While not depreciating criticism, he feared the excessive number of critics.

Mr. George A. Mulfinger, of the South Division High School, Chicago, discussed in his paper the *Sources of Kürnberger's Amerikamüde*. The belief so long current, to the effect that Kürnberger more or less embodied Lenau's experiences in the United States, seems to be entirely fallacious. The following works were, however, very skillfully used by Kürnberger: *Reise Sr. Hoheit des Herzogs Bernhardt zu Sachsen-Weimar-Eisenach durch Nord-Amerika in den Jahren 1824-6* (herausgegeben von H. Luden, Weimar, F. von Raumer); *Die Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-Amerika* (Leipzig, 1845, Dr. M. Wagner und K. Scherzer); *Reisen in Nord-Amerika in*

den Jahren 1852-3 (Leipzig, 1853, G. Duden); Bericht über eine Reise nach den westlichen Staaten Nordamerikas (Bonn, 1829); Sealsfield's Morton oder die grosse Tour; George Howard's Brautfahrt, Der Squatter Regulator und Das Cajütenbuch.—The details of these investigations are soon to be published in *Americana Germanica*.

In his paper on *Taine*, Dr. H. P. Thieme offered an explanation of Taine's salient quality, based on psycho-physiology. Taine's system and salient quality are inseparable and lead to a high standard of morality; a morality whose province lies in the tearing down and building up of the physical organism, from which evolve the psychic or moral phenomena.

Of the paper on *The Development of the Middle High German Ablaut in Modern German* by Dr. Paul O. Kern, of the University of Chicago, only that portion dealing with the development of the MHG. preterite into its present form was presented, 1. the appearance and disappearance of subdivisions, 2. the leveling out of sing. and plur. 1. In series i, ē as well as ei seems to have been simultaneously supplanted by the vowel of the plural; in ii ou yielded to the ö-class. In iii we find o (Brenner, *Grundzüge* § 56) and schund (*Z. f. d. Phil.* xxxii, 108 f.) by the side of the old sing. a. For the new o-classes in iv (*befohl*) and v (*wog*) see von Bahder, p. 109, 110. 2. The victory of the vowel of the plural in all classes but one is due to the following causes: its domination within the tense (i, ii, iv, v), recurrence in the past part. (i, ii, iv b (*befehlen*)) v b (*wegen*), furnishing a means of differentiating from the new present (i, ii) and vowel lengthening (iv a, v a). Von Bahder's suggested explanation of the retention of MHG. a in iii needs modification. The ä-subjunctives do not appear before or simultaneous with the u-plural (cf., for example, *Americana Germanica* i, 3, 46). The pronunciation finde for fünde removed the latter from its indicative by grouping it with the pres. This reduced the majority of the vowel of the plur. in the pret. ind. giving the sing. an even chance.

The following officers were elected to serve for the ensuing year: President, Starr W. Cutting, University of Chicago; Secretary and Treasurer, Raymond Weeks, University of

Missouri; First Vice-President, Violet D. Jayne, University of Illinois; Second Vice-President, John R. Effinger, Jr.; Third Vice-President, Laurence Fossler, University of Nebraska; Members of the Council, C. Alphonso Smith, University of Louisiana; A. R. Hohlfeld, University of Wisconsin; W. E. Simonds, Knox College; C. von Klenze, University of Chicago; C. W. Eastman, University of Iowa. The next annual meeting of the Central Division of the Association will be held in Chicago.

CLARENCE WILLIS EASTMAN.
University of Iowa.

CHAUCER'S lavender.

CHAUCER uses the word *lavender* only once. It occurs in the *Legend of Good Women* (l. 358), in the following brief description of Envy:

Envye is lavender of the court alway;
For she ne parteth, neither night ne day,
Out of the hous of Cesar; thus seith Dante;
Who so that goth, algate she wol nat wante.

'Dante' means *Inferno* xiii, 64, and the passage there (as quoted by Skeat) runs as follows:

La meretrice, che mai dall' ospizio
Di Cesare non torse gli occhi putti,
Morte commune, e delle corti vizio,
Inflammò contre me gli animi tutti.

Skeat glosses Chaucer's *lavender* as *laundress, washerwoman*; and in his note (Clar. Press ed. of *Leg. of Good Women*, p. 143) says that Chaucer "has neatly substituted *lavender* for the *meretrice* of the original," and he adds (*Works*, vol. iii, p. 304) that the "presentation to us of Envy as the person who washes all the dirty linen of the court, is particularly happy."

The figure does not seem to me such a happy one, and I cannot think that Chaucer means to say all this by his word *lavender*. It is not his habit to drag in such remote and hidden allusions, especially when there is no suggestion of them in his originals. The word here is evidently a fair equivalent of *meretrice*; and this meaning is, I think, safely established by the following quotations. Here as ever the *Oxford Dictionary* (though it does not de-

fine Chaucer's word correctly) gives generous assistance. Under the forms *lavender*, *launder*, *laundress*, two definitions of the word are given: 1. a person who washes linen; 2. a caretaker of Chambers in the Inns of Court. Chaucer's word is quoted under the first head. The use there and in other places will help us to arrive at a third definition.

One of the earliest occurrences of the word is in the legend of St. Brice (*Altengl. Leg. Neue Folge*, p. 156):

Jan bifell on þis manere :
A woman þat his lander was
In þat tyme had done trespass :
Flesly scho had his body filde,
And was deliuer of a knaue-childe.

This *lander* was one who "come and gede, and wessche his clothes, when þai had nede," and the innocent St. Brice is accused of complicity in her 'trespass.'

In a fourteenth-century ballad (Wright, *Specimens of Lyric Poetry*, p. 49), in which an old man describes the joys of his youth, we again find the word in evil surroundings:

Whil mi lif wes luther ant lees,
Glotonie mi glemon wes,
With me he wonede a while;
Prude was my plowe fere,
Lecherie my lavendere,
With hem is gabbe and gyle.

The dictionary reference to Barbour's *Bruce* again does not bring out the specific color of the word as there used. It occurs in the episode of the king and the laundress in labor (xvi, ll. 270-292), and the laundress is here taken as the type of a creature least worthy the king's notice.

To these three examples of the use of the word may be added another, taken from the story of Edmund Leversegge, an unpublished narrative preserved in a British Museum manuscript (Addit. ms. 34, 193), of which I possess a copy. The story tells of a vision which came to one Edmund Leversegge of Frome, in the county of Somerset, on the eve of the feast of Corpus Christi, 1465, during a time of pestilence. In this vision Edmund is directed to proceed to the University of Oxford and spend some years there in the study of theology. He receives specific directions as to his behavior

there, and certain pleasant vices he is warned against, among them one in the following words:

Also she seid Icharg þe þat pou go never to þi launder howse ne lett her com in þi chamber as long as pou art in Oxforder. Moreover I charge þe þat wat tyme pou felist þi flesch rebelle agenst þi saule, use pou to fast bred and watur, and on day in þe weeke Icharg þe to fast watur, etc. (f. 130).

In two later occurrences of the word, the meaning *meretrix* is beyond question. In Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit* (ed. Brydges, p. 65), in the tale of the evil life of Roberto, we are told that

"he had shift of lodgings, where in every place his hostess writ up the remembrance of him, his laundress, and his boy; for they were ever his in [that is, inn] household; besides retainers in sundry other places."

The context here shows that *laundress* can mean only *mistress*. Again in Webster's *White Devil* (act iii, sc. ii, p. 65, Symond's edition), Francisco, in turning over the leaves of a book which contains the names of all offenders lurking in the city says, when he comes to the large section devoted to the harlots:

Did I want
Ten leash of courtezans, it would furnish me;
Nay, laundress three armies. That in so little paper
Should lie the undoing of so many men!

It is an interesting meeting of extremes when Spanish *cortesana* and French-English *lavender* come together in the same meaning.

GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP.

Columbia University.

HEINE AND WILHELM MÜLLER.

I.

In the early years of his literary career, before he had gained such fame as to make him independent, Heine did not weary of casting about for patrons and friends among the prominent authors of his time. Even the incomplete correspondence in the last volumes of the Hamburg edition of Heine's works includes a considerable number of letters written

with the evident, though somewhat covert object of gaining the favor of men who could be useful to an ambitious young poet striving for public recognition. Unfortunately, not all these letters can be said to bear the stamp of ingenuous sincerity; Heine did not hesitate, on occasion, to use the luring bait of flattery, and his flattery is palpably calculating rather than frankly enthusiastic. It is not at all surprising, of course, to find Heine positively deifying Goethe, and attributing his poetic inspiration to Goethe's influence, in a letter dated December 29, 1821; it is somewhat of a shock, however, to find a letter to Adolf Müllner, written the very next day, in which Heine adroitly caresses the author of *Die Schuld* in order to coax a favorable review of his *Gedichte* from Müllner the influential editor; he even goes so far as to assure Hofrat Müllner, with an easy pun, that *Die Schuld* is to blame for his, Heine's, having become a poet. A year and a half later, May 4, 1823, Heine takes pains to write to the curious pedant and collector, Maximilian Schottky, that the latter's Austrian folk-songs had strongly affected the form of the poems in the *Lyrisches Intermezzo*, and June 10, 1823, to Fouqué, of the influence of the ballad of Dofia Clara in the *Zauberring* upon *Almansor*. These two statements happen to be correct enough. Quite different with a letter written at the same time, May 4, 1823, to Uhland,¹ in which Heine pretends to "a harmony of sentiment and life" with the good Swabian that certainly never existed; nor does it appear that Uhland was at all deceived by this pretense, for there is no evidence that he ever returned Heine's advances.

Wilhelm Müller was one of the poets whose friendship Heine made a special effort to gain in the manner suggested; and it happens that we have a letter to Müller that contains a most interesting confession of literary indebtedness. This letter probably was not the first Heine addressed to Müller; it is more than likely that he wrote an earlier letter to accompany the copy of the *Tragödien nebst einem lyrischen Intermezzo* sent to Müller in 1823, with the inscription

¹ *Deutsche Revue* xxii, 152.

"Als ein Zeichen seiner Achtung und mit dem besonderen Wunsche, dass der Waldhornist das lyrische Intermezzo seiner Aufmerksamkeit würdige, überreicht dieses Buch der Verfasser."²

Unfortunately, the whole of Wilhelm Müller's library and correspondence was destroyed by fire, and the letter of June, 1826, Max Müller tells us, "escaped only because my mother, a great admirer of Heine, had preserved it among her treasures."

How Müller received Heine's advances it is impossible to say. Heine speaks in the letter just mentioned of the "liebevolle Aufnahme, welche meine Tragödien und Lieder bei Ihnen gefunden," but if that refers to a direct answer, this answer is not now extant. Heine may refer here—a lapse of memory would explain the inexactness of the reference—to a very brief and not very enthusiastic notice by Müller of a cycle of seventeen lyrics contributed by Heine to the *Aurora* for 1823, almost all of which were soon after incorporated in the *Lyrisches Intermezzo*. The notice runs as follows:

"Siebzehn Lieder von H. Heine, der unlängst eine Gedichtsammlung zu Berlin herausgegeben hat, verdienen Aufmerksamkeit. Es herrscht in ihnen ein freier, eigenthümlicher Klang, und unter einigen unbedeutenden und verfehlten zeichnen sich mehrere durch Originalität der Empfindung aus."³

Müller then singles out the poems now numbered 14, 16, 29, and 35 in the *Intermezzo*. When this somewhat grudging and very meagre bit of criticism—the only mention of Heine's name in Müller's collected works—is compared with the enthusiastic praise Müller lavished upon other poets who were very inferior to Heine, the natural inference is that the latter did not appeal strongly to his sympathy. At the same time, it is not at all probable that Müller shared the hostile attitude of his friends, the Swabians, towards Heine; in that case, his wife would scarcely have been "a great admirer of Heine."

However that may be, Heine's expressed

² The late Professor F. Max Müller still had this copy in his possession; see *Cosmopolis*, vol. iv, 635.

³ Müller's *vermischt Schriften*, ed. by Schwab, Leipzig, 1830, v, 430.

admiration for Müller was certainly sincere and lasting; for while his early praise of Schlegel and Uhland, for instance, gives way to sarcastic disparagement, he never mentions Müller without respect, and even affection. In the *Harzreise*, Müller is one of the poets whose "beautiful songs" are sung upon the Brocken (Elster iii, 162); and it seems significant that, whereas in the first redaction, 1825, Uhland is mentioned first, in the second, 1827, Müller's name leads. In *Italien*, 1828, (Elster iii, 265), a reference to "des allzufrüh verstorbenen W. Müllers Rom, Römer und Römerinnen" calls forth the lament "ach, er war ein deutscher Dichter!" Finally, the mention of Müller in the *Romantische Schule*, 1832-3 (Elster v, 350), is unusually sympathetic:

"Wilhelm Müller, den uns der Tod in seiner heitersten Jugendfülle entrissen, muss hier ebenfalls erwähnt werden. In der Nachbildung des deutschen Volkslieds klingt er ganz zusammen mit Herrn Uhland; mich will es sogar bedücken, als sei er in solchem Gebiete manchmal glücklicher und überträfe ihn an Natürlichkeit. Er erkannte tiefer den Geist der alten Liedesformen und brauchte sie daher nicht äußerlich nachzuahmen; wir finden daher bei ihm ein freieres Handhaben der Uebergänge und ein verständiges Vermeiden aller veralteten Wendungen und Ausdrücke."

By far the most important document for the relation of Heine to Müller, however, is the letter of June 7th, 1826,⁴ sent with a copy of the *Reisebilder*. The following extracts will indicate the character of this letter, the most explicit testimony Heine ever gave of his indebtedness to another poet:

"Ich bin gross genug, Ihnen offen zu bekennen, dass mein kleines Intermezzo-Metrum nicht bloss zufällige Ähnlichkeit mit Ihrem gewöhnlichen Metrum hat, sondern dass es wahrscheinlich seinen geheimsten Tonfall Ihren Liedern verdankt, indem es die lieben Müllerschen Lieder waren, die ich zu eben der Zeit kennen lernte, als ich das Intermezzo schrieb. Ich habe sehr früh schon das deutsche Volkslied auf mich einwirken lassen; späterhin, als ich in Bonn studierte, hat mir August Schlegel viel metrische Geheimnisse aufgeschlossen, aber ich glaube erst in Ihren Liedern den reinen Klang und die wahre Einfachheit,

wonach ich immer strebte, gefunden zu haben. Wie rein, wie klar sind Ihre Lieder und sämtlich sind es Volkslieder. In meinen Gedichten hingegen, ist nur die Form eingermassen volksthümlich, der Inhalt gehört der konventionellen Gesellschaft. Ja, ich bin gross genug, es sogar bestimmt zu wiederholen, und Sie werden es mal öffentlich ausgesprochen finden, dass mir durch die Lektüre Ihrer 77 Gedichte zuerst klar geworden, wie man aus den alten vorhandenen Volksliederformen neue Formen bilden kann, die ebenfalls volksthümlich sind, ohne dass man nötig hat, die alten Sprachholperigkeiten und Unbeholfenheiten nachzuahmen. Im zweiten Theile Ihrer Gedichte fand ich die Form noch reiner und durchsichtig klarer—doch, was spreche ich Viel von Formwesen, es drängt mich mehr, Ihnen zu sagen, dass ich keinen Liederdichter ausser Goethe so sehr liebe wie Sie. Uhlands Ton ist nicht eigenthümlich genug und gehört eigentlich den alten Gedichten an, woraus er seine Stoffe, Bilder und Wendungen nimmt. Unendlich reicher und origineller ist Rückert, aber ich habe an ihm zu tadeln Alles, was ich an mir selbst tadle: wir sind uns im Irrthum verwandt und er wird mir oft so unleidlich, wie ich es mir selbst werde. Nur Sie, Wilhelm Müller, bleiben mir also rein geniessbar übrig, mit Ihrer ewigen Frische und jugendlichen Ursprünglichkeit. . . . Ich bin eitel genug zu glauben, dass mein Name einst, wenn wir Beide nicht mehr sind, mit dem Ihrigen zusammengenannt wird—darum lasst uns auch im Leben liebevoll verbunden sein."

Heine himself was not the first to call attention to the similarity in tone between his *Intermezzo* and Müller's lyrics. An anonymous reviewer of the *Intermezzo* in Brockhaus' *Litterarisches Conversationsblatt*, Sept. 23, 1824, wrote as follows:

"Keine Nachahmung oder Ähnlichkeit, aber eine innere, gleichsam musikalische Verwandtschaft im Anschlagen desselben Tones, in einem ähnlichen Tonfalle, in einer gleich leichten Behandlung der Sprache und im glücklichen Versbaue mit den Liedern Wilhelm Müllers ist mir darin aufgefallen. Doch wer weiss, ob dies nicht mehr ein individuelles dunkles Gefühl als etwas Wirkliches ist?"

As Heine mentions this particular review with high praise in a letter to Moses Moser (June 24, 1825), it may be inferred that its phraseology was not without influence upon the strikingly similar words of the letter to Müller.

Let us now see what evidence can be found to test the correctness of the statements Heine makes in his letter as to Müller's influence

⁴ *Werke*, Hamburg, 1861-3, xix, 273; also in *Heines Briefe* ed. by Steinmann, I, 47, and in part in Strodtmann's biography, second ed., I, 235, and in G. Karpeles, *H. Heines Autobiographie*, Berlin, 1888, pp. 149, 195.

upon his poetry. The tendency towards insincere flattery with an ulterior motive which appears in other of Heine's letters, makes a close examination of these statements necessary.

No one can read the first two collections of lyrics in Heine's works—the *Junge Leiden*, including poems written 1817 to 1821, and the *Lyrisches Intermezzo*, almost all of which was composed in 1822—without feeling the marked difference between them, such a difference as does not exist between the *Intermezzo* and *Die Heimkehr*, following immediately after it, 1823-4. The principal points of difference, apart from the subject-matter, appear to be these:—There is a great deal of crudity, harshness, and roughness in the poems of *Junge Leiden*, an affectation of primitiveness in the persistent use of archaic forms, an abuse of diminutives and of the horrible, a certain monotony of rhythm and of rhyme, due, for example, to the unbroken flow of trochaic or iambic movement, and the regular beat of exclusively masculine endings. The poems of the *Intermezzo*, on the contrary, are simple without archaic affectation, smooth and melodious without monotony, and characterized by a propriety of diction that is found but rarely in the earlier collection. It is evident enough that in the *Junge Leiden* Heine was misled into superficial imitation of the *Volkslied*, and that he finds himself, so to speak, in the *Intermezzo*. The time of transition can even be fixed with fair precision; the first poems in the characteristic tone of the *Intermezzo* are the tenth *Traumbild* (Da hab' ich viel blasse Leichen Beschworen mit Wortesmacht), and the third of the *Lieder* (Ich wandelte unter den Bäumen Mit meinem Gram allein), both dated 1821; and even in these there is a trace of the earlier harshness. Now this time of transition coincides closely with the appearance of Müller's 77 *Gedichte eines reisenden Waldhornisten*, published 1821, the very collection whose influence upon his *Intermezzo* Heine admits in his letter to Müller. Furthermore, these poems of Müller have precisely the qualities of simplicity, clearness, unaffected popular style, and insinuating melody, that distinguished Heine's *Intermezzo* from his earlier verse. We even have clear evi-

dence, if it were needed, that the change in Heine's manner was not a matter of unconscious development, but was the direct result of new artistic insight. Heine had announced his *Gedichte* in 1821, as "ganz im Geist und im schlichten Ton des deutschen Volksliedes geschrieben" (Elster i, 2). His new conception, at the same time a tacit condemnation of his own earlier practice, appears in a review of his friend Rousseau's poems, in *Der Gesellschafter*, Berlin, July 14, 1823:

"Es kommt darauf an, den Geist der Volksliedformen zu erfassen und mit der Kenntnis desselben nach unserem Bedürfnis gemodelte, neue Formen zu bilden. Abgeschmackt klingen daher die Titulaturvolkslieder jener Herren, die den heutigsten Stoff aus der gebildeten Gesellschaft mit einer Form umkleiden, die vielleicht ein ehrlicher Handwerksbursche vor zweihundert Jahren für den Erguss seiner Gefühle passend gefunden. Der Buchstabe tötet, doch der Geist macht lebendig (Elster vii, 220)." 5

As everything tends to confirm Heine's general statement of his indebtedness to Müller, so with the specific statement: "Mein kleines *Intermezzo-Metrum* hat nicht bloss zufällige Ähnlichkeit mit Ihrem gewöhnlichen Metrum." The reference must be to the flowing iambic-anapestic rhythm of the "Hildebrands-ton," the measure of Goethe's *König in Thule* and Heine's *Lorelei*, which is the characteristic meter both of Müller's 77 *Gedichte* and of Heine's *Intermezzo* and *Heimkehr*. A bit of comparative statistics on the lyric poetry most read by Heine at this time will be illuminative. In the first volume of Goethe's poems, of 150 *Lieder* and ballads only 4% are in the

5 A few years later, Müller formulates the theory that underlies his own practice in strikingly similar terms, in an essay published in *Hermes*, 1827 (*Vermischte Schriften*, iv, 105):

"Die eigenthümliche Natur des Volksliedes ist die Unmittelbarkeit seiner Wirkung auf das Leben. Das Leben kann aber nur durch das Leben lebendig ausgesprochen werden. Daher ist ein heilloser Irrthum einiger Modedichter der nächsten Vergangenheit, dass sie Volkslieder zu geben meinen, wenn sie alterthümliche Phrasen, unbeholfene Wendungen, auch wohl gemeine Dörbheiten aus den alten Vorbildern nachhaffend zu neuen Verbindungen zusammenfügen. Keiner Dichtungsart liegt es mehr ob als der lyrischen, zeitgemäß zu sein. . . . Die sogenannte alte deutsche Schule hat in solchen Verirrungen besonders ihr Mögliches gethan. Es hätte nicht viel gefehlt, so wären neue Volkslieder in der Sprache des alten Ludwigliedes gesungen worden. Und warum nicht? Jene Sprache hat doch einmal gelebt, aber die Sprache der neumodigen Volkslieder hat niemals gelebt. Und welcher Mensch kann dem Todtgeborenen Leben einhauchen?"

Hildebrandston; in the three volumes of the *Wunderhorn* only 2% of about 850 numbers are in this form; among Brentano's secular poems 8%; in Uhland's *Gedichte* (1815), of 135 *Lieder* and ballads 11%; of the 61 lyrics in Eichendorff's *Ahnung und Gegenwart*, 18%, but scattered as they were through the length of the novel, they could hardly make such a mass impression as if they had been collected. Müller's first published poems, the ones appearing in the little circulated collection *Bun-desblüthen* (1816), do not show a preference for the Hildebrandston, as only two of them are in this meter. In the 77 *Gedichte eines reisenden Waldhornisten*, 1821, the Hildebrandston suddenly appears as the overwhelmingly predominant note; of 64 *Lieder* and ballads, just 25% are in this form. In the second collection of the *Gedichte eines reisenden Waldhornisten*, 1824, also mentioned by Heine, 18% of the ninety poems are still in this meter, and about the same proportion holds for the mass of the later poems in ordinary German stanzas.

For purposes of comparison, I have arranged Heine's poems according to the years of their production, not according to published collections; the question of course being, not whether a poem happens to appear in the *Intermezzo* or some other collection, but whether it was written before or after 1821. For the dates Elster's chronological list was used (vii, 646 ff.); though this list is not absolutely reliable, it is quite sufficiently so to serve our statistical purpose. The figures run as follows: Before 1821 Heine wrote 60 *Lieder* and ballads, and 8% of them are in the Hildebrandston; in 1821 of 45 poems 29% are in this form; in 1822 (year of the *Intermezzo*) of 71 poems 49%; in 1823-4 (years of the *Heimkehr* and the *Harzreise*) of 111 poems 39%; in 1825-6 (years of the *Nordsee* and its free rhythms) of 9 strophic poems none are in this meter; in the ten years 1827-36 of 157 poems 10%; in the last twenty years of Heine's life this meter disappeared almost completely—there are only two poems among some 230, or less than 1%, in the Hildebrandston.

It appears immediately that the Hildebrandston is even far more predominant in Heine's poetry from 1821 to 1824 than in Müller's collections of 1821 and 1824, and that this striking

predominance again exactly coincides with the influence of Müller's poetry, to which Heine bears witness. One important difference must be noted, however: that Müller's poems in this form are almost all purely iambic, while with Heine there is just as decided a preference for largely anapestic rhythm. The difference is, indeed, generally characteristic; in all rising rhythms, Heine tends strongly toward anapestic movement, while with Müller anapests are always exceptional. But again, it appears that one of the two anapestic poems in the Hildebrandston in Müller's 77 *Gedichte* made a particularly strong impression upon Heine, judging by evident reminiscences of it in his poems; it is *Thränenregen*, beginning "Wir sassen so traurlich beisammen."

Besides the Hildebrandston, two others of Müller's stanzas might be mentioned, because of their relative frequency in the 77 *Gedichte* and the reminiscences of them that seem to appear in Heine's poems; but an examination shows that neither of them could have exercised any important influence upon Heine's choice of meter. The first of these is the stanza of *Die Prager Musikantenbraut*, which appears 4 times each in Müller's collections of 1821 and 1824; Heine uses this stanza 4 times before 1821 (including the translation of Childe Harold's "Good Night"), but not at all during the whole period 1821 to 1826, and only 4 times from 1827 to 1836. Then the stanza of *Des Postillons Morgenlied*, which appears 8 times in the 77 *Gedichte* and 7 times in the *Gedichte* of 1824; this is the most frequent stanza in Heine's poems before 1821, occurring 11 times (18%, evidently beginning with the translation of Byron's "Fare thee well"); it appears only once in 1821, twice in 1822, then 12 times in 1823-4 (10%), once 1825-6, and 25 times 1827-36 (76%). It is rather striking that the *Don Ramiro* stanza, so common in Heine's poetry (occurring 4 times before 1821, twice 1821-2, 20 times or 18% in 1823-4, 4 times 1825-6, 43 times or 27% in 1827-36—far more frequently than any form of this period), does not appear at all in Müller's two collections of 1821 and 1824, and is very rare in his later verse. So the meter of *Die Grenadiere*, frequent at almost all periods of Heine's verse, appears but once in Müller's. The

rhythm of the second *Traumbild* ("Ein Traum gar seltsam schauerlich") is the most frequent form in Heine's first period, and later almost disappears (13 times or 22% before 1821, once in 1821, 4 times in 1822, once in 1823-4, 3 times in 1827-36); Müller has this meter once only until 1824, then 13 times in his last period.

In general, Müller's poems show a far greater variety of metrical forms, Heine's, on the contrary, greater variation of rhyme-order. Wherever Müller uses the stanza of *Der ewige Jude*, he clings to the rhyme-scheme aabb; Heine has four different rhyme effects for this stanza, aaaa, aabb, abab, xaya. For the *Don Ramiro* stanza, Heine has eight different rhyme effects: aabb, abab, xaya, abba, axya, assa, asas,⁶ absence of rhyme; Müller has only the first three.

Neglecting differences of rhyme-order, the following table summarizes the relative metrical variety of the two poets, Heine's poems being counted up to 1836; the figures refer to the number of different stanza forms, quite apart from the frequency of any one of them:

	MÜLLER.	HEINE.			
	Iambic-anapestic.	Trochaic-dactylic.	Mixed.	Iambic-anapestic.	Trochaic-dactylic.
Couplets	19	12	—	1	2
Three-line stanzas	3	2	—	—	1
Four-line	37	30	—	31	13
Five-line	5	2	—	—	—
Six-line	16	11	—	9	5
Seven-line	2	—	—	2	1
Eight-line ⁷	2	1	1	1	—
Nine-line	—	2	—	—	—
Ten-line	—	—	1	2	—
Twelve-line	—	—	1	—	—
Fourteen-line	—	1	—	—	—
Totals	84	61	3	46	22

Of the fixed foreign forms, only the sonnet is common to both poets; Heine alone uses the *ottava rima*, Müller alone uses the distich, gloss, and *ritornello*. Both have free rhythms;

⁶ s indicates assonance instead of rhyme.

⁷ Including only such as are not merely reduplications of four-line stanzas.

in metrically regular, but unstrophic and rhymeless poems, Müller has four different forms, Heine one. Altogether, Müller has 154 different metrical forms, Heine only 78 in a larger bulk of poetry covering a much longer period of time. Both poets show a marked preference for iambic-anapestic rhythms, Heine even more decidedly than Müller; the latter has 88 iambic to 65 trochaic meters, Heine 49 iambic to 22 trochaic.

Heine seems to have been much less impressed by the content of Müller's poetry than by its form. Although in his letter of June 7, 1826, Heine greets Müller as "the poet of the *Griechenlieder*," there is not the least sign of the influence of these *Griechenlieder*, to which Müller largely owed his fame, upon Heine's verse; besides, the inscription in the copy of the *Tragödien* sent to Müller appeals expressly to the "Waldhornist," not to the Tyrtæus Müller. We can easily imagine that the somewhat strained rhetoric of the *Griechenlieder* would hardly appeal to such a skeptic as Heine, who, as a matter of fact, was never carried away by the almost universal sentimental enthusiasm of the time for Hellas struggling to be free. He could, indeed, find "much poetry" in C. L. Blum's collection *Klagelieder der Griechen* (letter from Berlin, March 1, 1822: Elster vii, 569 f.), but soon after he had his jest at "our Tyrtæuses" (*l. c.*, p. 579): and he never mentions Müller's *Griechenlieder*, even in *Die Romantische Schule*.

The popular romantic drinking-song and *Wanderlied*, very frequent in Müller's poetry, are scarcely found at all in Heine's; so too with the pious note of Müller's little cycle *Johannes und Esther*. Müller's poems swarm with stereotyped lyric figures, such as the miller and the miller's lass, hunter, gardener, musician, postillion, innkeeper's daughter, watchman, apprentice, and so on; of all these figures, only the knight, boatman, fisher-lass, and shepherdess play any part in Heine's poetry. Heine prefers original types, like the aesthetic tea-table of *Intermezzo* 50, or the lieutenants and ensigns of *Heimkehr* 66, to these conventional figures. In general, the *Rollenlied*, or stereotyped character lyric, which is the prevailing form with Müller, is not at all characteristic of Heine. So, too, Heine generally ex-

presses direct personal experience, while Müller for the most part works up conventional sentiments and motifs. The similarity in the treatment of nature by the two poets is doubtless due largely to common influences, especially the influence of the *Volkslied*; but here, too, the coincidences to be noted later indicate that Heine's usage was affected to some extent by his reading of Müller's poems. As poets of the sea, Heine and Müller appear to have been practically independent of each other.⁸

In this connection, the fact may be noted that the "pathetic fallacy" seems to have dawned upon Heine as an effective poetic device just at the time when he became acquainted with Müller's lyrics, in which this romantic postulation of sympathy between man and nature is a characteristic note; and even the formal parallel between the life of nature and the life of the soul, to which Elster refers as a peculiarity of Heine's style that rarely appears elsewhere, is to be found in many of Müller's lyrics.⁹

The most impressive evidence of the influence Müller's lyrics had upon Heine is to be found in the many echoes of motifs and turns of speech from Müller in Heine's poetry. The following list of striking parallels, eliminating all mere lyric commonplaces, will indicate the character and extent of this influence. The danger and difficulty of operating with such parallels is obvious; I have tried to minimize the risk of false conclusions by forming a sufficient background for this comparison, a background consisting of the lyric poetry of Goethe, Tieck, A. W. Schlegel, Brentano, Uhland, Eichendorff, the *Wunderhorn*, Büsching and v. d. Hagen, *Sammlung deutscher Volkslieder*, Berlin, 1807, and Ziska and Schottky's *Österreichische Volkslieder*, Pesth, 1819. For

⁸ The *Vineta* question in its larger aspect—the sunken city in legend and in the works of Heine, Müller, and others—must be reserved for another study. It need only to be stated here that Müller's *Vineta*, which first appeared in the autumn of 1826, was of course unknown to Heine when he wrote his *Seegespenst* in 1825; and that, though Heine quotes Müller's *Vineta* in his *Nordsee* iii (Elster iii, 102), his own conception of the sunken city remained unaffected by it.

⁹ Elster, *Heinrich Heines Buch der Lieder*, Heilbronn 1887, p. xx, lxxvii; P. S. Allen in the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, iii, 71.

Müller's lyrics, quoted from the two-volume edition by Max Müller, Brockhaus, 1868, the date of first publication is given; for Heine's, quoted from Elster's edition, the date of composition, and in case of doubt with an interrogation point.¹⁰

The argument for the influence of Müller upon Heine in the passages to be quoted rests upon the following facts: that there is no corresponding similarity with all the mass of other lyric poetry studied; that the parallel passages, almost without exception, appear in Müller's poetry earlier than in Heine's; that the coincident passages in Heine's verse belong almost exclusively to the years 1821-24, or are later echoes from these years, the very ones for which Heine testifies to Müller's influence upon him. In a few isolated cases the dates indicate either mere chance coincidence or the possible influence of Heine upon Müller. A few of the parallels here given were noted previously by Karl Hessel, *Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht* iii, 47ff., and P. S. Allen, *Journal of Germanic Philology* iii, 35ff.

Before passing to Müller's poems, let us note a striking parallel with a passage from his book of travels *Rom, Römer und Römerinnen*, 1820. It is pretty certain that Heine read this book just before starting on his walk through the Harz; for he made a study of books of Italian travel after his return to Göttingen early in 1824 (Goedeke, *Grundriss*, 1st ed., iii, 449), and he shows his acquaintance with this particular book, as well as with Müller's letters to *Hermes* in 1821, by special reference to them in his *Italien* (Elster, iii, 266). The passage in question is a lyric outburst of Müller as he turns from a subject grown tedious to the freedom of nature:

"... und so will ich Dich denn heute in freier, grüner Natur für das trockene Feld schadlos halten, das Du . . . mit mir durchwandelt hast. Auf die Berge wollen wir steigen und uns umschauen in der blühenden Gegend: wir wollen in die Hütte des Landmannes treten, nach seinen Geschäften ihn befragen und von seinen Früchten kosten. . . (p. 113).

Here Heine seems to have found the thrice repeated keynote of the Prologue to his

¹⁰ Gedd.—Gedichte; Hk.—Heimkehr; L. I.—Lyrisches Intermezzo; N. F.—Neuer Frühling; Rom.—Romanzen.

Harzreise: "Auf die Berge will ich steigen,
Wo die frommen Hütten stehen, Wo die Brust
sich frei erschliesset Und die freien Lüfte
wehen." The same keynote is sounded again
in the poem *Elster* ii, 69, originally in the
Harzreise: Auf die Berge will ich steigen,
Auf die schroffen Felsenhöhn.

JOHN SCHOLTE NOLLEN.

Iowa College.

ALFRED'S SOLILOQUIES AND CYNEWULF'S CHRIST.

THERE is at least one passage in the *Soli-
loquies* which suggests acquaintance with the
Christ. It is that near the beginning of Book
III, where Alfred is discussing the future con-
dition of the righteous and the wicked, and es-
pecially the increase of happiness and misery
due in each case to the sight of the other band.
This obviously resembles *Chr.* 1234 ff. It might
be presupposed that we are prevented from as-
suming direct borrowing by Alfred, by the fact
that Gregory the Great (*Patr. Lat.* 76. 1308),
and perhaps other Fathers, had developed the
thought, which in the last analysis no doubt
goes back to the story of the rich man and
Lazarus. What strengthens the probability,
however, of borrowing from the *Christ*, is the
occurrence of certain words in both passages.
Thus, *wuldor* and *wite*: (*Chr.*) *wuldor* 1243;
wite, 1249, 1269, 1292; (*Sol.*) *wuldor*, 65. 11, 22,
23; *wite* 65. 12, 15, 18, 19, 21, 23 (I quote from
Mr. Henry L. Hargrove's forthcoming edition).
So (*ge)sēōd*: *Chr.* 1244, 1253, 1256, 1270, 1285,
1291, 1300; *Sol.* 65. 14, 16, 19. With *pā hwile*
þe hī on pisse wearulde wēron (*Sol.* 65. 13) cf.
the sentences beginning with *pēden* (-an):
Chr. 590, 597, 772, 800, 814, 817, 1325, 1574,
1579, 1583. But perhaps the most striking
parallel is suggested by *Sol.* 55. 23: *ælc hefð*
be hys gearnunge swā wite, swā wuldor,
swæðer hē on byð. This recalls *Chr.* 595-6:
swā wite, . . . swā wuldor, . . . swā him lēofre
bīð tō gefremmanne. We have the combina-
tion again, it is true, in *Soul and Body* 7-8:
swā wite, swā wuldor, swā him in worulde ær
efne þæt eorðsæt ær geworhte. On the ques-

tion of Cynewulfian parallels compare those
adduced in my article on the Wærferth preface
in MOD. LANG. NOTES 17. 7 ff.

A peculiar combination of *ær* and *æfter* is
found in our text and in the *Judith*. *Sol.* 55.
26 has: *ælc hæfð be þām andefnum þe hē ær*
æfter æarnað; and *Jud.* 65: *swylcne hē ær*
æfter worhte.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

CHAUCER'S 'bees.'

"Next, o'er his books his eyes began to roll,
In pleasing memory of all he stole,
How here he sipp'd, how there he plunder'd snug,
And suck'd all o'er, like an industrious bug."

The Dunciad i, 127-130.

A contributor of *Notes and Queries* for May
17, 1851 (p. 387), because of "the incongruity of
the terms 'sipp'd' and 'industrious' as applied
to 'bug', argues that "Pope may have originally
written this passage with the words 'free' and
'bee', as the rhymes of the last two lines."
This is an uncalled for elutriation, not an elucidation,
of the text. It serves, however, to call to mind the curious text-history of line
353 of Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules*, which
is well told by Prof. Lounsbury (*Studies in
Chaucer* i, 242 f.). "There can be scarcely any
doubt that *flyes* was what Chaucer wrote," says
Prof. Lounsbury (although he had previously
received *bees* into the text of his edition
of the poem). Chaucer 'withouten doute' wrote
flyes, but why? The answer, though simple,
may be worth a moment's attention.

The modern reader must be reminded of the
obsolete generic use of *fly*, 'any winged insect;
as the bee, gnat, locust, moth, etc.' [N. E. D.],
with which is to be compared the use of French
mouche. In Chaucer's day it was common to
use not only the specific name, as *bee* (cf.
French *abeille*, and Old French *e* pl. *es*), but
also the particularized generic name, as 'the fly
that maketh the honey' (cf. *He is ase pe smale*
ulge pet makeþ pet hony. *Ayenb.* 136, quoted
in N. E. D.; *these flyinge flyes that we clepen*
been. Chaucer, *Boeth.* iii, metr. vii; also *The
Parson's Tale* 469), which is also paralleled in

French by *mouche à miel* (cf. *Des eeps qui font le miel... Les mouches qui font le miel qu'on appelle eeps*. *Bout, Somme rur*, quoted by Godefroy s. v. e.). English and French are at present interestingly contrasted in the exclusive use of *bee* and the preferred (almost exclusive) use of *mouche à miel*; when the reference is clear, *mouche* without modification may signify *abeille*:

"Un jour Charlot par hasard
Se voit piqué d'une abeille
Mais les mouches, dès l'instant."

The fifteenth century scribes who changed Chaucer's *flyes* into *foules* (and thence into *briddes*) committed merely a common blunder of the eye. In a catalogue of *foules* the unexpected word *flyes*, because of a general resemblance in written form to *foules*, was misread without a thought of the context. But one may also keep in mind that the way was now preparing for the acceptance of the new generic names, Latin *insecta* (pl.), *insect* and Welsh *bug* (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, xvii, cols. 60, 61). On this point the *N. E. D.* gives the significant references, although it may be added that in 1530 Palsgrave defines the specific 'bee' by the old generic 'fly' (Ellis, *E. E. P.* p. 77), and that there is a lingering of this generic use in *Ecclesiasticus* xi, 3: "The bee is little among such as fly; but her fruit is the chief of sweet things." And finally our *Dunciad*-commentator reminds us of the specialized sense in England of *bug*, in consequence of which, it will be remembered, Mr. Bug successfully petitioned to have his name changed into Mr. "Norfolk-Howard."

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Pulcinella & C., par HENRY LYONNET. Avec une Préface de GUSTAVE LARROUMET, Membre de l'Institut. Ouvrage illustré de 50 photographies. Paris: Société d'éditions littéraires et artistiques, Librairie Paul Ollendorff, 1901 (*Le Théâtre Napolitain: Le Théâtre hors de France*, quatrième série).

In that passage of extraordinarily brilliant im-

agination, remarkable verbal power, and concentrated dramatic history which, under the name of *Venise la nuit: l'Enterrement de Watteau*, the Goncourts have incorporated in their *Pages retrouvées* and reproduced to close their *L'Italie d'hier*, they have incidentally given a descriptive and picturesque catalogue of the types long associated with the Italian stage and largely transferred to the drama of other countries. There are Pierrot descended from Pedrolino and Sganarelle (made by Mollière out of the Zan(n)i into Zanarelle); there are Flautino and Lelio the lover and Sylvia the stock sweetheart; there are Fricasso and Fracasso, (Ja-) Coviello and Fracisquina and Cassandro; Brighella and Spezzafer, Colombine, Trastullo, and Lucia; Maramao, Cardoni, Zerbinnetta, Violetta and Narcissino; Cocodrillo, Cucurucu, and Cucurogna, Tartaglia, Fenocchio, Fiqueto, Scapin, and Zerbino; Gian-Fritello, Gian-Farina, Franca-Trippa, Beltrame, Gradelino, Tracagnino, Traffaldino, Arlequino, Razulio, Pantaleone, the Bolognese Doctor, Mezzetino, and Scarameuccia; Giangurgolo and Spavento; and there were the

"triumphs of Pulcinello, straight as his beaver, having a great air in spite of his red nose and his little pointed paunch, proudly brandishing his wooden sabre, astride, more solemn than a Balbus, upon a Pulcinello crosswise carried by two Pulcinelli."

Nor is this all. For, as M. Lyonnet brings to notice in the course of his happily-wrought history rediscovering and showing the resurrected Pulcinella, whom he had been told had been relegated and was dead, many other types have been or still are prevalent, even if often reduced from their pristine prestige, popularity, or political power: Gianduja of Turin; Girolamo of Milan; Stenterello of Florence; the Guappo and the very modern Don Felice of Naples; the Rugantino, Felicetto, D. Anselmo (Tartaglia), Baldassare, Palummella (Colombine), not to speak of Sarciapone and the less generalized Pascariello and Sciosciammocca; of temporary types like Don Fastidio; or of the classification by characters and not names as in the *amorosa*, *prima* and *seconda donna*, *servetta*, *sciocco*, *anoroso*, *buffo*, *caratterista*, *biscegliese*, and others.

Such an array gives force to the particular treatment of the Neapolitan Theatre with which M. Lyonnet has continued his series of studies upon the *Theatre in Spain*, the *Theatre in Portugal*, the *Theatre in Italy*, and volumes dealing with *Historical and Literary Excursions (Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, and Spain)*, and *Across Unknown Spain*. The books upon these dramas are written with a reverse of usual methods. Professionally, M. Lyonnet is not a man of letters, but a man of affairs. His books deal not with dramatic theory but with practice. And his comparative criticisms have all the greater value as from one who has so fully studied the older and seen and stated the more modern manifestations of the stage in the Latin nations. He supplements these studies of dramatic data by historical, topographical, and anecdotal proofs, and so produces with the acumen of a trained business mind, the terseness of the experienced traveler, and the literary flavor of a lover of books and of a student of previous information where accessible in print or in tradition, a volume unconventional, delightful, and distinctly a permanent contribution to the knowledge of a theme of much interest in itself and of much importance to cosmopolitan dramatic literature. Upon these matters M. Lyonnet has shed much light. He has written the first complete history of the subject. He has brought together the conditions of the problem—as to the past and the perpetuation of Pulcinella—and its place in dramatic art. And he has beautifully proved the perfect compatibility of commercialism and culture, which he had already shown and still illustrates as *Directeur de la Revue Universelle Internationale Illustrée* in Geneva, and constant contributor to *l'Intermédiaire des Chercheurs et Curieux*, the French *Notes and Queries* in which he is an authority, and to other historical publications.

The interest in Pulcinella, then, is due to many factors, not the least of which is his heredity. There is another contrast of the fat and the lean than the eternal one of Alain Chartier's *Débat du gras et du maigre*, or of pecuniary plethora and poverty so well represented in the typicism of Zola's *Ventre de Paris*. There is the antithesis under similarity

of sentiment. And so existed Maccus and Bucco, the pivots of the antique Atellane art, the country clowns of classical Campania. Maccus, the meagre, and Bucco, the bloated, are brothers in physical desires and psychical qualities. Both are braggarts and cowards, conceited and cringing, simple and sly, inane and witty, liars and licentious, thieves and terrific trenchermen. Compounded now of the fat of the one, now with the famished form of the other, from these Pulcinella descends. But he is more the scion of Maccus than of Bucco. M. Lyonnet gives the proofs of this. From Maccus Pulcinella gets the humped back, the hooked nose, and the huge paunch. The *pivetta* of Maccus is perpetuated as the *pratique*, or whistle, of Pulcinella. Maccus was the *mimus albus*. Pulcinella wears the large white collarless blouse, wide white trousers, white shoes, pointed white hat, black skull-cap (Maccus was close shaven), and the half-mask of glazed leather¹ with hooked nose, a costume changed only when, representing another than himself, he adds a garment or wears a head-covering associated with his new character. The very simplicity of the garment is a proof of age, and of an origin near to the populace; the smock frock of the peasant, the laws which forbade variegated garments to the lower classes, the working blouse of to-day, all these are predicated by the persistent tenure of Pulcinella's theatrical costume. And, as the coarse clowns of Roman farce used Oscan or Italic dialects, so Pulcinella alone in the plays wherein he appears uses the Neapolitan dialect in contrast with the pure or perverted Tuscan of the other types. While, still further as collateral proofs of conservatism is the parallel drawn by M. Lyonnet between the Pompeii of the past and the Naples of the present, seen in the shops and homes of one room opening upon the street, as in the *bassi* of Naples; in the niche for protecting divinity transformed into the lighted Madonna or saint shrine of square, or corner, or building, or home; in the funerals of multiplied musics and mourners now become extraordinary processions of gaily-colored banners,

¹ Cf. Molière's original use of the *masque*, subsequently relinquished, in playing *Mascarille* (*maschera*, *mascarilla*).

gildings, plumes, penitents, charity children, and hired weepers of both sexes in traditional costumes, a sad Saturnalia, a lurid accompaniment of garrulous and gesticulatory grief.

It is in this sense that *Pulcinella* has not merely hereditary dramatic interest, but a historical one as well. He is a type. He incarnates Naples. As says M. Lyonnet:

"*Pulcinella*, let it be known well once for all, is born between Santa Lucia and the Porta Capuana. He is Neapolitan from head to foot, and all the attempts made to drive him from home will fail."

He is localized in Naples and has not even strayed or stayed in other Italian spots. The French *Polichinelle*, his nearest relative, is very different.

"Let us leave *Polichinelle* to France, *Punch* to England, *Hanswurst* to Germany, *Toneelgek* to Holland, *Don Christoval Pulichinella* to Spain, *Karagheus* to Turkey."

For these are not inherently the same as *Pulcinella*, but only superficially imitative.

M. Lyonnet's work is thus a commentary upon a country (one recalls the Kingdom of Naples) represented in a dramatic character, and so has a value as reflecting with remarkable vividness the constitution of its civic life and the characteristic of its people called by the author "the most restless, the most noisy, the most exuberant of the earth." Violent and vivacious, gay and goodnatured, quick and quarrelsome, a mimic and a mocker, a born comedian and a perspicacious critic of human nature, the Neapolitan passes the larger part of his life upon the pavement, and it is this life which M. Lyonnet has made into a brilliant and vivid series of pictures showing the spectacles of the streets and having a sociological bearing. There are the vendors of petty wares and various foods who often lend animation to the plays showing Neapolitan life. There are the stated feasts of gigantic gluttony, prepared by daily payments for months to some prospective purveyor, and the incredible amounts disposed of then, or devoured upon the stage in realistic style. There are the festivals of the Madonna del Arco and of Piedigrotta, marvelous popular excursions of international reputation. There are the theatres varying in size from the largest—the

San Carlo—to the smallest—*la Fenice*—in Europe, and upon their history and importance M. Lyonnet has touched. There are the same things existing described by Dumas two generations ago in the *Corricolo*, and which so clearly differentiate the Neapolitan from other natives of Italy. There is the Lottery which nets the Government more than thirty million lire annually, and the *Smorfia* which gives a number for twenty-two thousand words covering the catalogue of every concrete case or abstract idea in human possibility. And as illustration M. Lyonnet quotes from *Roma*, a Neapolitan newspaper:

"The drawing of yesterday, at Frattamaggiore has been providential for that town and the environs, because all the families, from the richest to the poorest, had played the numbers 26-37-71 with reference to a ridiculous accident befallen the priest while he was saying the mass. The winnings rose to an enormous height. 26 represents the mass; 37 the priest; 71 the colic. At Frattamaggiore and Afragola this triplet came out five hundred and thirty-seven times and brought more than a million to the players. Never was colic more fatal to Italian finances."

There are also the two hundred and eight Fraternities, associations for mutual benefits or burials, whose origin dates from the tenth century, and whose members in variegated garments, play such a part in the life of the people. There is the *Camorra* which has been such a terror in Naples, and which has reacted upon not merely the drama but the literature.

'La Camorra, mot dont les romanciers fantaisistes ont tant usé et abusé, de telle sorte que l'on se fait, hors de Naples, une idée très vague de ce que ce mot veut dire, n'est en somme, comme on l'a définie souvent, que l'exploitation du faible par le fort, du lâche par l'homme courageux, du travailleur par l'oisif: figurez-vous une vaste association avec chefs, sous-chefs, etc., organisée en vue d'opérations diverses de chantage, avec coups de couteau tout prêts à l'adresse des récalcitrants, et dont tous les membres ont juré l'obéissance passive. "La Camorra, a écrit M. Marcellin Pellet à qui j'ai recours toutes les fois que j'ai besoin de faits précis, a joué un rôle considérable dans l'histoire de Naples, même dans son histoire littéraire. Les romans de Francesco Mastriani nous la montrent à l'œuvre, surtout son livre *I Vermi, studii storici sulle classi pericolose in Napoli*, consacré à l'étude des camorristes,

des vagabonds, des forçats, des mendians et des prostituées. Des romans de Mastriani ou la vie des bouges est si bien prise sur le vif, on a tiré des drames populaires comme la *Spigaiola di Pendino*, la *Pettinatrice di San Giovanni a Carbonara* ou la *Medea di Porta Medina*. M. G. Cognetti avec ses drames *A Basso Porto*, *A Santa Lucia*, *la Mala Vita*, mieux écrits, mais non moins bien observés, a mis également les camorristes sur les planches. Dans les théâtres napolitains on applaudit ces scènes de mœurs locales avec autant de passion que les farces de Pulcinella."²

This will explain what M. Lyonnet has said elsewhere:

"Woman in the Neapolitan drama, as moreover in Neapolitan life, occupies so small a place that she does not count."

And everywhere are songs and shrill cries and shouts and shrieks of laughter, and baskets for filling by passing merchants sliding and shooting from the upper regions upon the head of the wayfarer, and everywhere a mixture of lazy people and *lazzi* and *lazzaroni*, of sacred and profane contrasts, and an atmosphere of music and masques and *maccheroni*. And the pivot of play, the pride of populace, with a power and a presence permeating the most densely peopled and perhaps most illiterate (40 per cent of conscripts; 56 in Campania, 67 in Salerno, and the women, worse city in Europe, stands Pulcinella, type of the *popolano*, lover of the hot-spiced and highly-smelling *pizzaiuolo*, idol and incarnation of the sensual, superstitious, inconsequential, turbulent, goodnatured, dangerous, impulsive, patient, and perpetually fascinating Neapolitan.

Pulliciniello, *Policinella*, *Pulcinella*, *Polecenella*, *Pullecincella*, *Pulcinella*, or *Pulcinello* appears in the sixteenth century as a name, and even in the fifteenth as Joan Polcenella (and other forms are *Pulecenella*, *Pulecenello*). As a stage type he is assigned to Silvio Fiorillo—the famous *Capitan Matamoros*—by his contemporary Cecchini—the

² *Naples contemporaine*, la Camorra, p. 80 et suiv.—Voir aussi: *La Camorra par Marc Monnier*, Florence, 1862.—*La Camorra, studio di sociologia criminale*, par G. Allongi, Turin, 1890.—*Usi e costumi dei Camorristi* par M. le Docteur A. De Blasio, fondateur du bureau anthropométrique de la préfecture de Naples avec préface de Cesare Lombroso, Naples, L. Pierro, 1897.—Catalogue Emilio Prass, Naples, 1898, p. 10 et suiv. (Note of M. Lyonnet).

great *Frittellino*—and by others. But arguments against Fiorillo's being its "inventor" are that he is never represented as in the character; that his son Scaramouche never played it; that the type scarcely appears in the Italian troupes in France; that even in Molière, as in the intermezzo of the *Malade imaginaire*, he is merely substituted for the Pedant (cf. Moland: *Molière et la comédie italienne*); and that as Maurice Sand (*Masques et Bouffons*) says and M. Lyonnet thinks, Fiorillo restored the character

"and entrusted the role to Andrea Calceste, called *Ciuccio*, who imitated to perfection the accent and the manners of the peasants of Acerra, near Naples."

With the theory of Pulcinella's name one is even more at sea. M. Lyonnet quotes Maurice Sand:

"The specialty of Maccus was to imitate with the mouth the cry of birds and the puling of pullets, by means of a sort of call which became the *pratique*, the *sgherlo* or *pivetta*. . . . Maccus was thus surnamed, because of his cries of frightened fowl, perhaps also because of his nose like a beak and his odd walk (long-limbed, round-shouldered, bulging-stomached) *Pullus galinaceus*, then, by contraction, *Pulcino*, and *Pulcinella*."

M. Lyonnet adds:

"However this may be, I infinitely prefer this version to that of the abbé Galiani, which makes this name come from a certain Puccio d'Aniello, villager with a comic face, with long nose, who in the seventeenth century made the fine days of a troupe of perambulating comedians in Campania."

Yet does this do full justice to the possibilities? Galiani was both *littérateur* and learned. More, he was a Neapolitan. And in that time, when things were thoughtlessly accepted and yet traditions persisted, when attempts at accuracy of investigation were swamped by the mass of details and prevented by the impossibility of consulting archives, the incomplete tabulation of materials, or the lurid light reflected from the coming Revolution and subverting society and study, it would be strange had the antiquarian *abbate* been vulgarly misled, or had he invented an inanity of superficial linguistic science. Besides, the bridge from actual peasant Puccio to historical actor of

peasants Ciuccio is not so wide either in sound, or in style of art. And there is no reason entirely to discard the tradition of the gay and witty villager beating at repartee the strolling band of passing players of whose *lazzi* he became leader.

Nor does M. Lyonnet mention other derivations which have been assigned. If *Pulcino* is a diminutive for *pullet*, and so an affectionate or other nickname, or an abbreviation to an inferior, one recalls that Pulcinella is the part of a servant, and with the trait of fidelity which cements affection. Thy servant may not be a dog; but he may be a cheerful chicken. The reference might be solely to the chicken-beak-nose. And if Pulcinella be accepted as "hen-chicken," the reference is to the squealing, nasal, shrill voice, and the timid character well expressed by the feminine termination seen in Pulcinella. But still further, *Policinello* may have sprung from the *pulex* of the past. Many reasons would seem to suggest this: 1. "Little Flea" as a term of semi-affection type is as plausible as the similar use of the names of other animals for diminutives of attachment, or as sportive sobriquets. Again, 2, the prominent proboscis of the flea or its puce-coloring may have been assimilated with the suggestive nose or the mask of the player. So, 3, affinity might have arisen between the biting character of the insect and the caustic remarks of the actor. Still further, 4, the characteristic of the type is his agility and activity, his suppleness and spring. Now Naples, like Italy, is famous for its fleas. What more simple than a mediæval creation based upon such facts, in a place where nickname and characteristic coalesce at every turn, as in the surname of a great patron of the Pulcinello of his time, Ferdinand IV, called Nasone. For completeness the mere statement of these theories would have been in place in a book within whose short compass has been crowded the discussion of such a very large number of facts. Some of these may be indicated: sketches of the long lives, the simplicity of living, and the playing and playwrighting of the pious and patriarchal men who have made themselves immortal *Punchinellos*; an idea of the prolific production of pieces connected with this par-

ticular stage—Altavilla printed a hundred plays—only a small portion of his work,—and M. Lyonnet quotes a man who told him that he had seen four hundred different Pulcinella plays; the large, if crude, work of Cerlone—the Goldoni of the Neapolitan theatre—and of Lorenzi, his more literary rival; the history not merely of the distinctly popular theatres, the *Nuovo* and *Florentini* and the little ones where Pulcinella reigns, but glimpses of those connected with high comedy and operetta; the non-technical character of this popular stage, direct inheritor of the *Commedia dell'arte* of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, practically devoid of stage scenery, without intrigue, without concatenation of circumstances, depending upon situations, and so, essentially popular (for the populace is not diplomatic but direct, and passion with it is not patience but promptness), and alone making possible the daily dual playing of perpetually changing pieces, where Pulcinella plays "a soggetto" and individually improvises; the hereditary office, the perpetuation of family fidelity to the stage, of dancing and dramatic dynasties such as the names of Cammarano, Petito, de Angelis,³ and the present De Martino and Pantalena, with talent dominating the inconsistencies of their particular art; the connections with this stage for a musical moment, or the friendships for its players, of Lablache, Donizetti, Verdi and others; and in a delightful way is told in the first person, as is written the book, the bibliography of the theme, to which many foot-notes throughout add proofs of the author's scholarship.

So out of play, pantomime, or parody, contest of ephemeral incident and phase of permanent value, remains a large fund of interesting dramatic history, a gay yet caustic view of human nature, and a sequence of hereditary power of representation. M. Lyonnet, however, has discussed the other conditions obtaining in the modern dramatic status of Naples. He has devoted two chapters to the Popular Neapolitan Drama—the 'blood and

³ An interesting coincidence is suggested by the talent and reputation, so much appreciated in America, of Jefferson de Angelis. Mr. De Angelis kindly informs me that he knows of no positive connection with the Neapolitan family. The coincidence is all the more striking.

thunder' type, as seen in such plays as *The Foundation of the Camorra*, or *The Belle of the Porta Capuana*, melodramas and pictures of customs and codes.

Another chapter gives an admirable and witty description of the Christmas *Cantata of the Shepherds*, full of extraordinary puerilities and crudenesses, with costumes and setting as incongruous as those of mediæval representation (Adam and Eve in blue percale upon which are sewed pink paper roses; Satan with worn black kid gloves; and a *pear*, showing traces of the bitings in a previous rehearsal, hanging from a *bamboo* tree to represent the holy and historic apple), and from which can be well gauged the old *Mysteries*. But particularly has M. Lyonnet set forth and, while praising the talent, scathed the methods of Eduardo Scarpetta, 'reformer' of the Neapolitan stage, inheritor of its traditions, bitter foe of Pulcinella, and who for more than twenty years has won fame and fortune by his adaptation of French plays, his translations called 'reductions,' his change of titles, his suppression of the authors' names, and his getting the credit and the cash for these Franco-Italianized comedies—of Scarpetta. The law of compensation holds here only partly. The French adaptations of Italian types or models in the earlier centuries were often different from persistent and bodily transfers. Judged independently of this rule, the success of Scarpetta, actor, manager, 'reducer,' is a tribute to French dramatic influence, duplicated in so many plays, and to French conception of human nature, applicable to universal conditions. It is also a new proof of generalizing power and of the creation of typical, even though specific individualities (most welcome to the type-trained Italian stage), which cannot but delight the lover of evidences of French intellectual power. Here M. Lyonnet becomes eloquent in his logical defense of Pulcinella banished by Scarpetta as antiquated, unnatural (so are all *masques* of old Italian comedy), and needing reformation (which Scarpetta makes by creating a new stock type, *Don Felice*, and by translating, translating, translating French plays, and changing old Neapolitan ones), while claiming that the suppression of the *masques*—who represent knaves, or bullies, or imbeciles—"is

working for the good of the country," an argument which M. Lyonnet proves would rule out satire, reality, Molière, Goldoni, all the great dramatic authors as character-creators, or types like Tartuffe. As to *masques*, it is unnatural that a person may wear one, when all others speak open-facedly.

"In actual life, in history, we have never heard speak save of the Iron Mask which was led from citadel to fortress with a masque upon the face, and even then it is proved that this iron mask was of velvet."

But the masque is, first, a convention, and, second, a tradition. Suppress Pulcinella, and you suppress the entire Neapolitan stage

"of which he is the soul." He has "that flower of a special perfume which grows only at the foot of Vesuvius, the good, big gaiety of Pulcinella, child of the mole, whose originality charms me because above all it smacks of the soil." "Pulcinella is an institution."

He may be unreal. But if you reform him, be consistent.

"Is it natural, for example, that people who have a tongue in the mouth, should make great gestures, in the manner of deaf-mutes, to exchange their ideas?

No. Then we must suppress pantomime. Is it natural that a person should smear his face in white, should dress in the same way, and should wear a black-skull cap?

No. Then we must suppress Pierrot (that is, the clown).

Is it natural that two lovers should adore each other in music and should repeat to each other for a quarter of an hour: *je t'aime, bonheur extrême*, etc., or that multitudes should vociferate without stirring: *let's run! let's leave!*

No. Then we must suppress the opera.

Is it natural that in the midst of a conversation some slightly clothed ladies should break in to dance a little cut?

No. Then we must suppress ballets.

Is it natural that an actor who has remained alone upon the stage should experience the need of expressing himself in a loud voice, should approach the footlights, wink and loll his tongue, seeming to confide in the public? Is it natural that, the play over, the principal personage, in spite of all verisimilitude, and following a custom superannuated and fortunately disappeared from our (France) midst, should address a word to the spectators to solicit their indulgence?

No. And yet things do not take place otherwise in your so-called reformed theatre, for love of truth.

Absurdity the masque of Pulcinella, absurdity the flour of Pierrot, the red cue of Gianduja, the wooden sword of Harlequin, the stuttering of Anselm, the thick utterance of Guignol, I grant it. But zounds! in all your reforms just leave me something original and amusing. It's with this system of unification pushed to excess that the inhabitants of the five parts of the world have arrived at all walking in dress coats and in silk hats and in being prodigiously bored in merely looking at each other.⁴

M. Lyonnet shows also other things: the influence of Mme. Matilde Serao of whose "Answers to Correspondents" in a newspaper, plying her *savoir-vivre* with childish questions as to conventionalities or proprieties, he gives an amusing account; the freedom from French formalism and functionarism and the bane of the *bureau* in all things, which makes the theatre and life so much easier elsewhere than in France; the rapidity of representations without waits (partly due to the need of haste, since plays are given twice in succession in one evening, and greatly to the practical abolition of scene-shifting where such slight paraphernalia—principally a background—exist); the proofs (in the Pulcinella plays) of a 'popular' taste in that the piece is appreciated in proportion to the length of its title; in that the titles are extraordinarily picturesque; and in that these plays are amusing, non-psychological, episodic, naive, and never descend to obscenity. M. Lyonnet also points out the interesting parallel between Pulcinella and Pierrot immortalized by the genius of Debureau and made literature by Champfleury, Gautier, and the book of Jules Janin; and the perpetuation of processes in playing which have three hundred years behind them, with other customs ranging from the call for unmasking before the play to the final "compliment" to the public followed by a little concert or vaudevilling. And in addition, he shows striking analogies and anticipations ranging from *Cyrano de Bergerac* to other lighter pieces of modern com-

⁴ Cf. in *Charles Demailly* of the Goncourts a somewhat similar phrase, speaking of the eighteenth century and its colored clothes:

"Et que diable veux-tu, Franchemont, que l'homme soit gai avec un habit noir? Dans ce temps-là, le vêtement riait avant l'homme; aujourd'hui, il pleure d'avance. . . Drôle d'idée, d'avoir mis la vie en deuil . . ."

edy; and the superficial character of this stage, rarely printed.

"One attaches—in Italy—so little importance to dramatic endeavors. The theatre is a place of rendez-vous, of conversations, of visits; very rarely a place of studies and of observations as with us (France)."

M. Lyonnet has produced a volume of extreme value and interest, and one which ranks him in scholarship and in sprightliness with the best and the most vivid histories due to authorities upon the subject. It is not a discussion of the dry détails of dramatic construction and of theories of technique. But it is an acute and witty and 'living' treatment of a theme closely touching dramatic art at various times and in different countries. It is also a guide to specific modern conditions in a given time and place. As M. Larroumet so well states it in closing his introduction:

"Without apparatus of erudition or pretension of any sort, he gives us an exact and complete study upon one of the most popular and the most curious types of the universal theatre. Are there many books more majestic and of higher aims of which as much might be said?"

We have the hope that M. Lyonnet will do several things: give us books particularly upon the Russian and the other forms (Czech, Hungarian) of the Slav stage. And that he will come to America and give us his skilled and trained impressions of our own drama, which will be long—if it ever does so—before nationalizing. It is not imported British Ballets, nor falsified "French Folly." Our material is large and amply suggestive. There are tales from the times of the Argonauts to the lives of fisher folk, Cape Cod or other. There are types from the Creoles to Canadians. There is the drama of war (*Shenandoah*). There is the New England play (*The Old Homestead, Way Down East*). There are *Colorado* and the cow-boy. There are Texas Terrors. There is the middle ground of *In Mizzoura*. There is *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and the inevitable play of the future upon race questions. There are our own society and sociological problems presenting themselves. And there are the dramatizations which will yet come, of much in Cooper or upon the Indian. A study by M. Lyonnet of our purely American stage would

be exceedingly valuable, and the more as seen by practiced outside eyes. And because of the critical and historical power, with rare vivacity, which he has so well shown, we willingly place ourselves in his hands.

A. GUYOT CAMERON.

Princeton University.

DANTE.

Strenna Dantesca: Compilata da ORAZIO BACCI e G. L. PASSERINI. Firenze, Anno Primo, 1902.

AMID the many discouraging things in respect to the social, political and industrial condition of Italy to-day, it is with sincere pleasure that we note the successful founding, in recent years, of two societies, both taking their name from the great Florentine poet. The one, *La Società Dante Alighieri* founded in 1890, is patriotic and practical in its objects, and especially aims at the preservation of the Italian language beyond the borders of Italy, and the protection of Italian emigrants and laborers abroad. The growth of this society has been very rapid, the number of members now amounting to nine millions. *La Società Dantesca Italiana*,—on the other hand, is of a more distinctly literary character, its object being to spread and increase the knowledge of Dante, and to prepare a critical edition of the *Divina Commedia*, and the minor works. As is well-known a beginning has been made in respect to the latter, by the definitive edition of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* by Prof. Pio Rajna. All Dante scholars are looking forward with peculiar interest to the critical edition of the *Divina Commedia*, which in spite of the multitude of books on Dante, still remains a desideratum. Of more interest to the general public in Italy are the popular lectures on the *Divina Commedia* instituted by the *Società Dantesca*, in Florence, Rome, and elsewhere, distinguished professors and scholars, such as Del Lungo, Mazzoni, Rajna and others, being invited to interpret the various cantos.

One of the results of the success of these two societies is the publication of a small annual volume called *Strenna Dantesca*, under

the editorial management of the well-known Dante scholars Orazio Bacci and G. L. Passerini. This little book contains a *Calendario Dantesco*,—with appropriate quotations from Dante or with historical notes, under each day of the year; the latter running as far back as the events of Dante's own life, and at the same time recording such recent events as the death of Scartazzini (February 12, 1901), and the inauguration of the Dante lectures in Rome (February 24, 1901).

Then follows a rather promiscuous collection of brief articles, notes on Dante's life, an extract from Gabriele D'Annunzio's *Francesca da Rimini*, a bibliography of Dante literature for 1901, an account of the founding of the *Società Dantesca*, a report of the twelfth Congress of the *Società Dante Alighieri*, and several brief essays by Del Lungo, D'Ovidio, and D'Ancona. There are also a number of poems on Dante by poets ancient and modern, including Boccaccio, Michel Angelo, Pucci, Alfieri, Carducci. The sonnet of the latter is of especial interest in its frank avowal of Atheism.

Per me Lucia non prega e non la bella
Matilda appresta il salutar lavacro,
e Beatrice con l'amante sacro
in vano sale a Dio di stella in stella.
Odio il tuo santo impero; e la corona
divelto con la spada avrei di testa
a 'l tuo buon Federico in val d'Olona.
Son chiesa e impero una ruina mesta
Cui sorvola il tuo canto e a'l ciel risona:
Muor Glove, e l'inno del poeta resta.

OSCAR KUHNS.

Wesleyan University.

SPANISH LITERATURE.

El Capitán Veneno, por PEDRO DE ALARCÓN.
Edited with notes and vocabulary by J. D. M. FORD, Instructor in Romance Languages in Harvard University. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1899.

El Capitán Veneno, por PEDRO DE ALARCÓN.
Edited by G. G. BROWNELL, Professor of Romance Languages, University of Alabama. New York: American Book Company, 1901.

SINCE I agree entirely with the sentiment ex-

pressed by Prof. Heller in the January number of *MOD. LANG. NOTES*, that "if the critics would only do their worst, the editors might do their best," I have thought it worth while to go somewhat carefully through the two books above mentioned, and venture to point out some improvements that might be made in a future edition. Since Prof. Brownell's work appeared some two years later than Dr. Ford's, it is a matter of surprise that it contains errors that might have been avoided by a reference to the earlier edition. Every editor should adopt the *mot* of Molère, "Je prends mon bien où je le trouve," and so surpass the work of his predecessor instead of falling below it in quality.

El Capitán Veneno is an excellent story to put into the hands of students of the Spanish language, and the fact that both editors have supplied vocabularies indicate that the text is intended for early reading, and in this case it is not well to take anything for granted with pupils except the most elementary grammatical principles. This being the case, it seems to me that both editors have been guilty of some sins of omission. The references below are to Brownell's edition, because there is more to be said about it than about Ford's, which is generally quite correct.

P. 23, l. 13: This use of *sea* should have been noted; also as used, p. 46, l. 11. P. 30, l. 26: *Cuidadito* is given in the vocabulary as the dim. of *cuidado*, but we are given no hint of its peculiar meaning. As a matter of fact, it is a stronger term than *cuidado*. P. 37, l. 20: Both editors give us a more or less exact equivalent for *echar su cuarto á espadas*, but neither one translates or explains it, which should have been done. P. 38, l. 14: *perito agrónomo* can not mean "surveyor," but "skilled agriculturist." P. 40, l. 7: *Dado que*, as a conjunction, needs mention in the vocabulary. It occurs several times in the text. P. 42, l. 3: Ford's definition of *cordón* is correct but Brownell's is not. P. 43, l. 13: Brownell defines *sumaria* as "verbal process," which is not English. At least it is not found in the ordinary English dictionary. Ford's definition is too prolix. It here means simply "law suit," or "trial." P. 43, l. 30: Such expressions as *pasar por las armas* should have

been defined under the first word, not under the last; a fault of frequent occurrence. P. 48, l. 26: Both editors would have done well to say that *con que* means "so then," "therefore." Neither gives a satisfactory explanation of *acusar las cuarenta*, which should have a note. At the bottom of page 49 we are referred to the vocabulary for an explanation of *tomarse cariño*, but the explanation is wanting. P. 51, l. 16: *Volver loco* does not mean "go crazy," but "drive crazy." P. 52, l. 20: It looks as if both editors had mistaken the meaning of *lo trae como á un zarandillo*. Ford defines *zarandillo* as "winnowing fan," "frisky person." Brownell says "small flail," "lively person." It really means "small sieve" (dim. of *zaranda*), and the phrase means "to make one skip about as if shaken in a sieve." P. 57, l. 16: *Alma de Dios* is given various renderings, all unsatisfactory. "In God's name" would answer for all occasions.

P. 57, l. 31, and p. 86, l. 14: *Doblemente esa hoja*, according to Brownell, can only mean "let us fold this leaf," whereas it really means "let us turn over a new leaf;" that is, "let us change the subject." P. 59, l. 4: *Caramba* is defined merely as an "exclamation," just as if all exclamations had the same meaning. Similar criticism applies to various other words. P. 70, l. 3: Neither editor tells us that *el mes de las flores* is May, although, it is true, it might be inferred from Ford's note. In the same line Brownell defines *vispera* as "evening." It should have been "eve." *Antevispera* is said to mean "the day before yesterday," which makes no sense in this passage. P. 72, l. 2: *la de Dios es Cristo* should have been more fully explained in both books. P. 72, l. 21: If Brownell had followed Ford in explaining *reto en capilla*, his explanation would have been more satisfactory. Near the bottom of page 76 the explanation referred to under *haber* is lacking. The force of the last note on page 79 is not apparent, since the imperfect could not have been used here. P. 80, l. 13: *De* after *mirada* should be omitted. Both editors would have done well by explaining more fully the meaning of *Rodrigo en la horca*, below. P. 81, l. 20: Neither book has a satisfactory explanation of *dale que dale*. P. 84, l. 26: The note supplies *angustias*, but we are nowhere

told what this word means. P. 85, l. 10: Neither book tell us that *por algo* means 'for good reasons.' P. 90: The pupil might well wonder how the editors expected him to find out the meaning of the words at the head of the last chapter.

O. B. SUPER.

Dickinson College.

ITALIAN LITERATURE.

La Locandiera, by GOLDONI, with introduction, notes and vocabulary by Prof. J. GEDDES, JR., Ph. D., and Dr. F. M. JOSSELYN, JR., of Boston University: Boston, D. C. Heath and Co., 1901. 12mo, pp. vii, 114.

TEACHERS and students of Italian will welcome this convenient and attractive edition of a text admirably adapted for practical use. While, in the opinion of the present reviewer, modern language texts with special vocabularies are undesirable for college classes which have passed the elementary stage, they are serviceable in beginning a language, since they enable a class to take up reading early. For this purpose, *La Locandiera* is all that could be desired, and this edition gives enough assistance, but not too much, for students who have had a few preliminary lessons in Italian grammar. The editors should, however, have indicated in the vocabulary the gender at least of words like *affare, amore, arte, cenere*; and in this connection the query may be permitted whether such a vocabulary should not pay some attention to pronunciation. Either the student must continually refer to a dictionary—and in this case he could dispense with the vocabulary—or else he must depend entirely on the teacher for help in pronunciation. He cannot be expected always to guess correctly the pronunciation of such words as these, taken from *La Locandiera*: *albagia, bambagia, gelosia, asino, burbero, decoro, genere, fragile*. It hardly seems too much to ask that a special vocabulary should give at least the accentuation in doubtful or exceptional cases. It will be remembered that Prof. Grandgent, in his *Italian Grammar*, accents every word, and also indicates the quality of the vowels. Of

course, this means a little extra labor. One of the best-known editors of French text-books in America wrote to me recently, in a private letter,

"Omissions and inadequacies in a vocabulary are, I suspect, almost inevitable, for the time of a person who is competent to make one is worth more than one well made can possibly be expected to repay."

Possibly; but it seems to me that something more than royalties is at stake; and if the matter is left on this basis, I suspect that in the future even those college teachers who now believe in the use of vocabulary editions will make up their minds to worry along without them. These remarks are not intended particularly as criticism of Messrs. Geddes and Josselyn, who (except in omitting to give genders) have merely followed the general practice. Unfortunately the edition, admirable in many respects, contains a considerable number of errors. Of the misprints in the text, three are particularly regrettable, because they seem to mean something when really they reduce the sentence to nonsense; these are: *comando* for *comandano*, p. 10, l. 32; *crede* for *erede*, p. 17, l. 9; *Cavaliere* for *cavalieri*, p. 77, l. 18. Less serious are: *vogli* for *voglio*, p. 12, l. 14; *stâ* for *sta*, p. 19, l. 10; *serâ* for *sarâ*, p. 33, l. 19 and p. 68, l. 19; *campatisco* for *com-*, p. 43, l. 11; *Cav.* for *Mir.*, p. 44, l. 13; *sieto* for *siete*, p. 52, l. 11; *proprio* for *proprio*, p. 72, l. 17; (*piano al conte*) should be inserted, p. 72, l. 20, and the following words spoken by the Conte, not the Marchese. A speech has been left out, p. 50, between lines 3 and 4, as follows: *Cav. Va' via, che tu sia maledetto*, and the omission has left the *SERVITORE* to answer himself. P. 25, l. 20, *potrebbbero* seems a better reading than *potrebbe*.

In the notes and vocabulary, several interpretations are open to question, and others are positively wrong. P. 8, note 4, regarding the expression *tutte quante*, states that "tante is the antecedent understood of *quante*;" is not *tutte* here the antecedent of *quante*, though *tanti* may be understood in such an expression as *andate quanti siete* (p. 50, l. 20)? P. 21, l. 20: *ha una faccia burbera da non piacergli le donne*, is thus explained: "Gli is here redundant. *Le donne* is evidently put in as an

afterthought, in apposition with *gli*, for *alle donne*." This interpretation, even if possible, seems to me very far-fetched, and not in harmony with the context; surely the obvious interpretation is correct: "He has a surly face which shows that he does not like women." P. 25, note 2, the explanation of *da lei* belongs in p. 5, note 1. The doubling of the consonant, explained in *dille*, p. 31, note 3, occurs earlier, for example, *vattene*, p. 6; *fanne*, p. 18. "Ago" is not the best translation of "*sono . . . che* in speaking of time,"—at least, in the two passages where it is given; *sono sei mesi che è morto*, p. 4, l. 19, is rather "he has been dead for six months;" and in the other passage, *sono tre mesi che lo sai*, p. 5, l. 20, "ago" makes nonsense (cf. also p. 35, l. 21). Some notes give too free a translation, as p. 7, note 3. Some are unnecessary, as those which merely repeat meanings from the vocabulary; p. 4, portions of notes 1 and 2; p. 6, note 2; p. 21, note 1; p. 60, note 2. A few notes are needed on points nowhere explained, as *voi altri*, p. 7; *seco* used in the sense of "with him" (not *himself*), p. 72; and *beverò le sue bellezze*, p. 35, which is a phrase used commonly (as here) by one who drinks out of another's glass.

Coming now to the vocabulary, we find a number of "inadequacies." *Attacco*, p. 24, l. 19, may possibly mean "attachment," but its usual meaning, "attack," does equally well. The only meaning given for *cadere* and for *cascare* is "fall;" both are used in the sense "weaken, give in," pp. 22, 29, etc. "I am sorry" is better for *mi dispiace*, pp. 17, 18, etc., than "it displeases me." "Than" should be added to the renderings of *di*. *Ferro caldo*, p. 52, is translated "flat-iron;" but *ferro* alone has this meaning, p. 55, and surely the iron is not always hot. The only meaning given for *caldo* is "excited," which would thus have to be applied to the flat-iron in translating *è ben caldo*, p. 55, l. 7. *Quanto importa il conto*, p. 48, means "how much does the bill amount to?" but the only meaning given for *importare* is "to matter." *Mi sento mancare*, p. 60, means "I feel faint," of which no hint is given. *Ordinario*, p. 19, certainly does not mean "ordinary payment;" *mandare con l'ordinario* means "to send by post." *Manicotto* is out of

its alphabetical position. Under *perchè* the meaning "in order that" should be added; it is given in notes on pp. 28 and 55, but not when it first occurs, p. 15, l. 22. "Complacently" is wrong for *con placidezza*, p. 34, which means rather "placidly, quietly." "Pique" for *puntiglio*, p. 78, does not make good English; nor does "at any rate" for *tanp'* 2, p. 27. *Venere*, p. 9, seems different enough from Venus to be granted a place in the vocabulary.

Now, some of these slips are pretty serious; and yet they are not such as will prevent the edition from being used successfully with a class, provided the instructor is capable of detecting mistakes, and alert in pointing them out. It is hoped that the list of corrections and suggestions here given will facilitate the use of the book, and that the most necessary changes will soon be made in a second edition. Since text-books for Italian are necessarily less numerous than for other modern languages, it is all the more imperative that they be accurate and trustworthy; and this is my excuse for a somewhat long review. There remains to be discussed one more matter, which is of interest to students of Goldoni and of the drama in general. Anyone familiar with *La Locandiera* notices at once that in this edition two of the *personaggi* have been left out,—the *comiche* or *commadianti* Ortensia and Dejanira. Whatever may have been the reasons for this omission, which involves the loss of several complete scenes and the rearrangement of others, I think most scholars will agree that the editors owed it to themselves, if not to their readers, to declare what they had done. The only allusion is in these mysterious words (p. vi of the Introduction):

"For criticism in regard to the original version of the *Locandiera*, the student is referred to *Scelta di alcune commedie di Goldoni*, Firenze, 1838. The version here offered is practically the same as the one given on the stage in Italy, and that presented by Eleonora Duse on two different visits to this country."

Not a word as to wherein the "original version" differs from the "version here offered;" merely a reference to a book that must be inaccessible to the great majority of readers. When the seeker for "criticism" does succeed in getting hold of the wretched little *Scelta*, he

finds himself as far away as ever, since the editors have inadvertently given the wrong reference! Prof. Geddes has very kindly favored me with the correct one, which is this: *Il Teatro moderno applaudito*, 61 tomi, Venezia, 1796-1801; tomo xv (1797), pp. 91-96. Here we find stated the interesting fact that already in the eighteenth century the parts of the two actresses were omitted when the comedy was performed on the stage. The reasons given for the omission were that these characters retarded the action, and that without them the play actually gained in interest and unity; furthermore, that Goldoni himself evidently saw their want of connection with the other characters, since in the second act he brings them on the stage less than in the first, and in the third act only one of them appears, and that in only one scene. With these arguments I do not entirely agree. To be sure, the amusing scene in which Fabrizio inquires *per la consegna* the names of the newly arrived guests, although of interest because so similar to a well-known scene in *Minna von Barnhelm*,¹ is not important; but the manner in which the actresses are treated by the Marchese, the Conte and the Cavaliere respectively, throws no little light on the characters of these gentlemen. While the actresses are on the stage very little in the second and third acts, we continually hear about them, and many details are left meaningless when deprived of the original connection. In act iii, scene ix (of our edition, for of course the numbering has to be changed when scenes are dropped out), the Marchese puts the gold flask in his pocket, and then becomes greatly agitated for fear Mirandolina will find out that he has it. Surely even such a fool as he could put it back where he found it; but in the original version he gives it to Dejanira. Act ii, sc. i, a great point is made of the Cavaliere being served before the Conte, and later the Marchese sends to the Conte's room three glasses

¹ I do not know whether this relationship has been pointed out before. Prof. Primer, in his edition of *Minna von Barnhelm* (Boston, 1896, p. 132), compares the scenes where Mirandolina and Just, respectively, present their accounts: but he makes no further mention of Goldoni. In 1755, Lessing wrote to Mendelssohn that he was studying Goldoni's works, using the 1753 edition. *Minna* was not written until several years later.

of wine,—meaningless unless we know that the Conte is giving a dinner to the two actresses. He has previously explained to Mirandolina that he really does this for her sake, and the explanation applies to nothing whatever in the shortened version. P. 28, a speech is omitted between lines 11 and 12, bringing together two speeches by Mirandolina; and below, the Marchese's remark, *Conte, voi me la pagherete*, is altogether changed in its application. I have noticed but one case, however, where words actually spoken have been altered to fit a new application. On the whole, it is remarkable that the play can be extensively mutilated in this way, and still, with comparatively trifling exceptions, retain unharmed its outline, its consistency, and its effectiveness on the stage. All this throws light on Goldoni's method of dramatic construction, and is surely a topic worthy of discussion. Since the editors say nothing about the subject, it is not plain whether they were governed entirely by the arguments mentioned. Presumably, however, they were also moved, in making their expurgation, by a feeling that the characters omitted were intrinsically unsuitable for class reading. It may be of interest, if of no special importance, to note that a new edition of *La Locandiera* for Italian schools, with notes by G. Tambara (Torino, Paravia, 1901), omits nothing. I confess that to me the play in its complete form seems entirely unobjectionable; yet I am not disposed to quarrel with anyone who sees offense in it, and wishes, in an elementary text-book, to make excisions. Certainly, even in its reduced form, the play is interesting and profitable reading. Only, when an expurgated text comes to me, I like to be told so, in general terms at least, and not left to find it out for myself. Aside from its reticence on this point, the introduction in our edition is adequate for its purpose. In speaking of *Le Bourru bienfaisant*, the editors might have mentioned that this comedy is also well-known in Italian as *Il Barbero benefico*. To their short bibliography they might have added the titles of Rabany's *Goldoni, le théâtre et la vie en Italie*, Paris, 1896; and of recent works by Masi, Concari and Landau.

KENNETH MCKENZIE.
Yale University.

FRENCH-ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

A French and English Dictionary, by HJALMAR EDGREN, Ph. D., Professor of Romance Languages in the University of Nebraska, and PERCY B. BURNET, A. M., of the High Schools of Chicago. New York: Holt & Co., 1901, pp. xvi-1252.

THE purpose and scope of this new dictionary of the French and English languages is concisely stated in the introduction (p. v) in the following words:

"We have endeavored to prepare a work embodying: I. A scholarly and yet thoroughly practical French-English dictionary, founded upon the highest modern authorities, and embodying a measurably complete list of modern and obsolescent French words with their pronunciation, derivation, and earliest occurrence in the language, as well as their meanings and less obvious uses; and II. An English-French dictionary serving the purposes of French composition and speaking, and containing a sufficient amount of modern and archaic words with their pronunciation, and etymologically arranged, to serve the French student of English."

These general features of the dictionary are explained at greater length in the succeeding pages of the introduction, which further includes a list of dictionaries used in the compilation, the elaborate scheme of indicating pronunciation followed out in the body of the text, a list of the abbreviations used, and a table of French money, weights, and measures, with American equivalents. The introduction is very clear and satisfactory, but two points seem to call for remark. In the first place it is rather surprising in such a complete scheme of pronunciation not to find some provision made for distinguishing between the French final consonants which are silent under all conditions, and those which may be pronounced in linking, as *aspect* and *tabac*. In the second place the word *chronique* should not be cited under examples of English words (p. xiii, l. 11).

Upon opening the dictionary proper, the reader's eye is at once struck by the unusual appearance of the words. This is due to the system of marking the pronunciation already referred to, which consists of countless signs and double signs beneath and through the

letters and the use of italics for all silent letters. The compilers' purposes, to force the pronunciation upon the student's attention and to save space, are evidently accomplished. A further saving of space is secured by the grouping of related words under a single stem so far as is possible without sacrificing alphabetical order. That instant knowledge of the pronunciation and economy of space are great advantages to the student the reviewer will readily admit, but to one who uses his dictionary chiefly for translation the advantage is questionable, because of the greatly increased strain upon the eyes and attention in rapidly seeking for a particular word. Furthermore, though strictly logical, the scheme of indicating the pronunciation is so complicated that few students will take the trouble to master it. Besides the marks of pronunciation, each word is followed by a small figure to denote the time of its introduction into the language. This sign is a small ° for indigenous words, for others it is the first two figures of the actual date of introduction. The objection can be made to this system of dating that the number 17, for example, suggests to most students the seventeenth century rather than the year 17—, of the eighteenth century.

In a short review it is impossible to consider every word cited in the twelve hundred odd pages, the reviewer has, therefore, chosen for especial study certain arbitrary groups of words. In the French-English section of the dictionary these groups consist of the words beginning with *la*, prepared by Mr. Burnet, and those beginning with *ta*, as far as *tantôt*, by Professor Edgren. These sections have been minutely compared with the corresponding sections of the *Dictionnaire Général*,¹ the small *Dictionnaire Complet* of P. Larousse,² Gasc's *French and English Dictionary*, Student's Edition,³ and Heath's (Cassell's) *French and English Dictionary*.⁴ The results of this

¹ *Dictionnaire Général de la Langue française*, par Hatzfeld, Darmesteter, Thomas, 2 vols., Paris, n. d.

² P. Larousse, *Dictionnaire Complet Illustré*, 8e édition, Paris, 1896.

³ F. Gasc, *Dictionary of the French and English Languages*, New York, n. d.

⁴ Heath's (Cassell's) *French and English Dictionary*, by De Loim, Wallace, and Bridgeman, revised and enlarged by E. Roubaud, Boston, New York, Chicago, n. d.

comparison are very favorable indeed to the new dictionary. In the list of words cited in the French-English division the *Edgren-Burnet* follows very closely the *Dictionnaire Général*, in the number of words it is quite superior to the *Larousse* and *Heath* dictionaries, but, in turn, the *Gasc* far exceeds the *Edgren-Burnet*. The following table will show the relative position of the new dictionary more precisely, the figures after each name represent the number of words there found which are lacking in the other dictionary, double spellings and proper names are included.

Dict. Gén.: *la* 3, *t-lan* 5; Edgren-Burnet: *la* 1, *t-lan* 21.

Larousse: *la* 16, *t-lan* 9; Edgren-Burnet: *la* 88, *t-lan* 32.

Heath: *la* 33; *t-lan* 14; Edgren-Burnet: *la* 83, *t-lan* 31.

Gasc: *la* 197, *t-lan* 68; Edgren-Burnet: *la* 20, *t-lan* 9.

In the matter of definition the same groups of words in the *Edgren-Burnet* have been compared with the corresponding sections of the *Dictionnaire Général*, and the following variations have been noted. *Labour*, ploughed land, is not found in the latter dictionary, while *labdacisme*, abuse of words beginning with *l*, is not in the *Edgren-Burnet*. The new dictionary fails to give the date of introduction of the following words: 2. *la, labour, 2. lai, laicité, laideron, laite, lambel, launde, langouieux, langue, laryngotomie, laticifère, lauriot, 2. ta, tabiser, labourin, tabulaire, tâcheron, tacheture, tachygraphique, tactilité, tadorne, taille-douce, taïsonnière, talcaire, talcique, talcile, taluer, tamisage, tamise, tamiseur, tamisier, tanaisie, tangon, tanné, tantième*. The following words are dated differently by the two dictionaries, the first date is that of the *Dictionnaire Général*, the second that of the *Edgren-Burnet*: *labourer*, tenth century, eleventh century; *lapidification*, 1690, eighteenth century; *laps*, thirteenth-fourteenth, fifteenth century; *tabletter*, thirteenth, twelfth century; *tâche*, twelfth, thirteenth century; *tactile*, 1541, fifteenth century; *taillade*, sixteenth, fifteenth century; *taillandier*, indigenous or 1564, fifteenth century; *taille-crayon*, nineteenth, fourteenth century; *taillerie*, 1304, thirteenth century. Again, the

system of indicating pronunciation made use of in the *Edgren-Burnet* occasionally causes trouble in derived words where the accent or vowel quality changes. Thus the *Edgren-Burnet* has *tâbâc* (to follow the *Dictionnaire Général's* system of indicating quality) and hence (*tâbâgie* and (*tâbâquière*, whereas the second *a* in these words has the same quality as the first *a*.

The reviewer has not found it possible to examine the whole of the dictionary for misprints, but in the sections studied the following errors may be noted. In the Introduction, p. xiii, l. 25, the pronunciation mark over the *u* of *emulate* should be beneath the letter; p. xiii, l. 38, *ay* should read *ây* (?); p. xiv, l. 8, the *o* of *overtur* should have the mark beneath it, the *u* above. In the text, p. 622, read *tænia* for *tænia*; p. 623, read *tamandua* for *tamadua*.

With regard to the English-French section of the *Edgren-Burnet* dictionary the reviewer feels that there is no need of a detailed study, in view of the fact that from the word *abridge* onward there are only the most trivial differences in the word lists and definitions between the new dictionary and that published by Messrs. Heath & Co. The reviewer does not give voice to this report, which has been circulated during the last few months, without having first carefully compared a number of words under each letter of the alphabet in the two dictionaries.

On the whole the writer considers the *Edgren-Burnet* dictionary a most timely and excellent contribution to the means of studying French in the United States. There has been up to this time no small dictionary at a reasonable price which combines so many advantages as does this last one. With a sufficiently large vocabulary, we have with each word its meaning, pronunciation, etymology, and date of introduction into the language. No student could ask for more in an abridged dictionary.

MURRAY P. BRUSH.

Johns Hopkins University.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

Shakespeare Studies. Macbeth. By CHARLOTTE PORTER and HELEN A. CLARKE. New York: American Book Co., 1902.

THIS little book consists of two sections. The second includes the sources of the story (omit-

ting, however, the earliest of all, the account in Wyntoun's *Cronykil*) and other extracts from old books illustrating particular features of the play; the first, and more valuable, section is chiefly made up of questions accompanying each step of the action, and problems of interpretation and significance, which the student must solve for himself. Even old Shakespeareans will probably find here views and possibilities that had not occurred to them; while the younger student will be led to look below the surface and see that *Macbeth* is not merely a romantic tale, but a profound study of human souls, and an amazing piece of constructive art.

W. H. B.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF THE GERMAN ch.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—I have noticed some discussion as to the pronunciation of the German *ch* in the last two numbers of the MOD. LANG. NOTES. Is it not possible that the gentleman from New Haven and the gentleman from Baltimore could come to some agreement as to the English sounds that approximate the German frontal *ch* if each had an opportunity to hear the pronunciation of *hew* and *hear* from the mouth of the other? Vietor, *German Pronunciation*, second edition, p. 52, remarks, "It is not a regular English consonant, but sometimes occurs as the initial sound of *hue*, *hew*, etc." The statement is certainly correct according to the experience of the writer.

In teaching I have found that I can give the beginner the correct tongue position by having him pronounce first the English *sh* of *she*. Then if the tip of the tongue be lowered to the back of the lower teeth, the tongue is thrown forward into the position in which the German pronounces his frontal *ch*. A reference to the figures on pp. 28 and 29 of Grandgent's *German and English Sounds* will make this clear

to any one who has had a little practical experience in phonetics. Of course the process is somewhat awkward, and a good ear is the greatest help. The great trouble on the part of the American is the tendency to open the mouth too wide and to pronounce the sound too far back on the hard palate. The sound thus produced generally degenerates into a *k*. The tendency to pronounce a *k* can be corrected to some extent by having the pupil exaggerate the length of the sound. It is impossible to pronounce a long *k*. Of course a correct tongue position in the first instance renders the pronunciation of a *k* impossible.

GEORGE M. HOWE.

Cornell University.

THE UNIVERSITY OF GENEVA.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—*À propos* of the remarks about the summer session of the University of Grenoble in MOD. LANG. NOTES for February, permit me to call attention to another University which, if not French, is almost within the borders of France, and situated in a city whose mother-tongue is French and almost half of whose population are French citizens.

I believe I am right in saying that the University of Geneva was the *first* to establish a summer session for the benefit of foreign students. The plan was approved by neighboring institutions, such as Lausanne and Grenoble, and they were not slow to adopt the idea. At the summer session of the University of Geneva in 1900 seventeen nationalities were represented; there were five Americans.

Of far greater importance to foreigners than these vacation courses, however good they may be, is the *Séminaire du Français moderne* which forms part of the regular University work of Geneva, and which was founded for the purpose of giving a suitable training to foreigners who wish to teach French. It comprises the following courses: *littérature française moderne*; *étude des sources pour l'histoire de la littérature et de la langue françaises modernes*; *histoire des mœurs et des institu-*

tions en pays de langue française dans les temps modernes; méthodes et exercices pratiques d'enseignement; lecture analytique d'auteurs français modernes; stylistique; phonologie; prononciation et diction; syntaxe du Français depuis le xvi^e siècle, gallicismes; composition et improvisation; exercices écrits de langues et de style; conversation. This séminaire gives an excellent practical and theoretical training and has a large enrolment. I may be permitted to mention among the professors of Geneva the well-known, venerable savant, M. Eugène Ritter, who gives the course, *étude des sources*, and M. Bernard Bouvier who is the soul of the séminaire and whose inspiring courses *littérature française moderne* and *lecture analytique* are models of their kind. A *certificat d'aptitude à l'enseignement du français moderne* is given to those who successfully pass the difficult oral and written examinations.

In 1900-1901 there were fourteen Americans in attendance at the University.

It is hardly necessary to add that Geneva is one of the most charming and interesting of European cities, and that a sojourn there is very delightful.

WILLIAM KOREN.

Princeton University.

ROMANIC PHILOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Instruction in Romanic philology at the University of Paris has been greatly strengthened within the past two years. Instead of one chair with assistants, as was the case during the lifetime of the late Prof. Petit de Julleville, there are now two full professors, Thomas and Brunot. As a result the instruction has been more specialized. Prof. Thomas treats the formation of the Romanic languages, and Prof. Brunot the subject of French historical grammar. Both men by their publications have given ample evidence of their ability in their respective fields; Prof. Thomas by his collaboration on the *Dictionnaire général* and by his more recent work, *Mélanges d'Etymologie*;

historique de la langue française, and by the *Histoire de la langue*, which first appeared in the *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française*, and, which has since been published separately.

In addition to the university proper the *École de chartes* and the *École des hautes études*, which are now under the same roof as the university and which are scientifically, if not officially, parts of it, offer unusual opportunities in the same lines of study. At the former, Paul Meyer continues his lectures on the Phonology and Morphology of Old French and Provençal, and, at the latter, Gaston Paris offers seminars on special topics of Romanic philology and supplements this practical work by lectures on Old French Literature at the *Collège de France*. Both these men are so well-known that their names suffice to indicate the high character of their instruction.

A name less widely known but not unfamiliar to readers of the *Romania* is that of Maurice Roques, who has taken the place of Prof. Thomas at the *École des hautes études* and whose seminary in Vulgar Latin is a valuable adjunct to the work in Romanics.

If to this list of men, eminent for their scholarship, are added the phoneticians Rousselot and Passy, it is evident that the University of Paris and the institutions grouped about it, offer at present exceptional advantages for the study of Romanic philology.

EDGAR E. BRANDON.

Paris.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—It seemed to me in reading Dr. Brush's review of Mr. Goodell's *L'Enfant Espion* in MOD. LANG. NOTES for February, 1902, pp. 106 and 107, that many mistakes and omissions evident in the edition were passed unnoticed. The following are some of the points which I noted and mentioned to the publishers when the edition appeared.

Among words not explained, or not satis-

factorily explained in either notes or vocabulary, should be mentioned, *mutuelle*, 8, 19 = *école mutuelle*. If Mr. Goodell had consulted the *Dictionnaire Général* of Darmesteter-Hatzfeld he would have found the expression *enseignement mutuel*, with an explanation of the system in use in many European Catholic schools, of the instruction of younger pupils by older ones. *Un-tout-cas*, 28, 22 (= "an umbrella used for a sun-shade as well") is not in the vocabulary at all, neither is there a note on it. The latter would, considering the formation of the word, be much more useful than such notes as, for instance, that on p. 11, f.

"Soissons: the old Latin town of Noviodunum, later Suessio. Clovis conquered the Roman general Syagrius here in 486. It has also been the scene of many sieges, the last in 1814."

Why should this cheap erudition be inflicted on the student who happens to meet, in a story of the Siege of Paris, casual mention of "le chemin de fer de Soissons?" Why the note on the Valois à propos of the innocent remark on p. 34, 24 sq.:

"Comme il l'avait troublée dès le premier regard, ce jeune homme si correct, à qui—ses yeux de diamant noir donnaient l'aspect royalement fatal d'un Valois!"

Certainly an allusion to the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew (*Bartholemew* in the text) is not necessary to explain this. The note is really confusing to an open mind. That regarding the rue de Grenelle, p. 56, might also be to one who did not already know that *all* the streets described were to be found in Paris—a thing taken for granted by the editor.

Why add to the definition of "*bradel* (voc.), articles made from cardboard" the further rather vague explanation: "perhaps so called from the maker or inventor, the place where made, etc.?"

Coup de force, 40, 7, might well have been translated under *coup*. (*Coup de théâtre*, 21, 1, is given under *théâtre*.) Mr. Goodell has, in general, a rather erratic method of entering idioms, *vous allez en voir de grises*, for instance (79, 20), is translated under *aller*. Fortunately a note directs the reader to the lurking-place of the explanation.

Mr. Brush very properly remarks that, "one

would think that the editor had taken some school dictionary and simply gotten down the first meaning that he found after each of his French words."

He should, however, have noted especially and severely such words as *passer*, 45, 32 (= 'make'—the vocabulary giving only "pass, go by, go beyond"); *élèves* 51, 2 (= "breeders"); *déjouée* 51, 13 (= "baffled, foiled"); *tapisserie à personnages*, 71, 18 (= "tapestry representing human figures"—the vocabulary gives "imagerie"); *dégagement*, 69, 33 (= "private exit"); *faisceaux* 78, 20 (= "stacks," not "bundles"). There should be either in a note or in the vocabulary: *remettre les armes en faisceaux* ("to stack arms").

To the list of typographical errors given by Mr. Brush should be added, besides *Bartholemew*, mentioned above, *grédin*, 49, 17. Mr. Goodell has explained, in his preface, that he gives but few translations, 'the best results in his opinion being attained through personal explanation of the point under consideration.' Yet since he has explained a number of passages that required no explanation, he owes us a note in such cases as those cited.

The number of American reprints is increasing with great, in view of some facts one might almost say with alarming, rapidity. Nobody need now rush a text-book into print in order to get material sorely needed for his class-work. Let us seek, in our editing, quality rather than quantity.

MARY VANCE YOUNG.

Mr. Holyoke College.

BRIEF MENTION.

Parts of Speech: Essays on English. By Brander Matthews (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901). The normal mind will connotatively think of 'Parts of Speech' in a sense which could not be defined by anything as general and attractively indefinite as 'Essays on English.' The subjects of these essays are such as "The Stock that Speaks the Language," "The Future of the Language," "The Language in the United States," "Questions of Usage," "The Simplification of Spelling." These chapters are written in an engaging, chatty style, professedly literary rather than scholarly, and may be commended for "common sense in an

uncommon degree," and for sufficient accuracy to beget confidence in the author's judgment of many interesting questions. Many of the pages are aglow with a patristism that will impress the young; the more mature reader will pronounce some of these passages, especially the closing definition of "Americanism" (pp. 343-350), flat and commonplace. In "Questions of Usage" the young might be misled to take the "argument for liberty" to be "a plea for license," although there is duly given a warning against this danger. The author is fond of applying Spencer's principle of Economy of Attention; this he does in a very suggestive manner, as in "An Inquiry as to Rime" (at p. 276 f.; cf. also pp. 229, 233). These essays should be widely read. They can do only good, for they will quicken the perception of the principles of language. "Excessive refinement goes only with muscular weakness," says the author (p. 236); the refinement of his style in the instance of this book must not be supposed to warrant the expectation of a weak grasp upon scholarship.

Marie de France. Seven of her Lays done into English by Edith Rickert: with designs by Caroline Watts (New Amsterdam Book Co., New York, 1901). It is "with the hope that these tales 'of old unhappy far off things' may find friends among English readers," that this and its companion volumes have been prepared, and that we hereby call attention to this series of most attractive little books. It is worth while to complete the enumeration of the list: 1. *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. A Middle-English Romance retold in Modern Prose, with Introduction and Notes by Jessie L. Weston. With designs by M. M. Crawford; 2. *Tristan and Iseult*. Rendered into English from the German of Gottfried of Strassburg by Jessie L. Weston. With designs by Caroline Watts; 3. *Guingamor, Lanval, Tyoiet, Le Bisclavret*. Four Lays rendered into English Prose from the French of Marie de France and others by Jessie L. Weston. With designs by Caroline Watts; 4. *Morien*: A metrical Romance rendered into English prose from the Mediæval Dutch by Jessie L. Weston, with designs by Catharine Watts. The volume selected for the present notice contains an 'Introduction' which deals in a careful manner with the facts of Marie's life and work, and the

theories respecting her literary sources. The appended 'Notes' summarize for the reader results of literary scholarship, and thus constitute an attractive introduction to an important department of comparative literature. Profound research in language, folk-lore, fairy-tales, fables, history, tradition, etc., is here made attractive to the general reader without loss of accuracy, and even with some advantage to the technical reader himself.

Much Ado About Nothing. Edited by J. C. Smith (D. C. Heath & Co., 1902). This is another of the plays separately edited under the general supervision of Prof. C. H. Herford, which are known as 'The Arden Shakespeare.' The same editor contributed the *As You Like It* to the series and is, therefore, a tried hand in carrying out the avowed purpose to give special attention to the literary and artistic interpretation of the plays, though without neglecting the necessary points of grammar and language. In this plan of the general editor there is an implied rebuke of that 'purely verbal and textual' annotation which has too much hindered the appreciative study of the master-pieces. The plan of the series has been well followed by each editor, and this last number of the series meets all expectations. It has its share of points of special interest, such as a text adapted to "an easy introduction to the textual criticism of Shakespeare" (Appendix A), and the old stage-directions with the problem of the character 'Innogen' (pp. vii, xii, 73, 145). In the case of such a special point in the history of the play as the list of plays which were produced at Court in the spring of 1613, in celebrating the marriage of Princess Elizabeth and the Elector Palatine (p. viii), the student should have references for verification.

The grammatical note against line 17 shows excellent care of such matters, and equally discriminating are note 14, 15 (and others) on 'Euphuism' and note 81 on the Messenger's exclamation "I will hold friends wtth you, lady." But the editor has not had the courage to strike the comma out of line 63, and note i, 3.20 is too subjective in its reference to the rhythmic character of the 'remonstrance.' The "Criticism" of the play (p. xiii f.) will reward study. The whole constitutes a text-book of excellent quality.